

УДК 81'37:159.955

DOI <https://doi.org/10.32782/2410-0927-2023-19-12>

Ірина РУДІК

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри іноземних мов гуманітарних факультетів, Одеський національний університет імені І. І. Мечникова, Французький бульвар, 24/26, м. Одеса, Україна, 65058
ORCID: 0000-0001-9208-4923

Марина ТЕР-ГРИГОРЬЯН

кандидат філологічних наук, доцент кафедри іноземних мов гуманітарних факультетів, Одеський національний університет імені І. І. Мечникова, Французький бульвар, 24/26, м. Одеса, Україна, 65058
ORCID: 0000-0001-7558-2533

Бібліографічний опис статті: Рудік, І., Тер-Григорьян, М. (2023). Співвіднесеність семантичної категорії оцінки з різнорівневими засобами її вираження. *Актуальні питання іноземної філології*, 19, 75–79, doi: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2410-0927-2023-19-12>

СПІВВІДНЕСЕНІСТЬ СЕМАНТИЧНОЇ КАТЕГОРІЇ ОЦІНКИ З РІЗНОРІВНЕВИМИ ЗАСОБАМИ ЇЇ ВИРАЖЕННЯ

Стаття націлена на глибокий аналіз взаємозв'язку між мовою та мисленням, спрямовуючи увагу на одну з ключових тез – наявність обмежених семантичних категорій, які формують значення слів. Відзначається, що ці семантичні категорії завжди нерозривно пов'язані з конкретними лінгвістичними засобами кожної окремої мови. У зв'язку з цим, ці категорії розглядаються як комплексна мережа різнорівневих мовних виразів, призначених для точного передавання конкретних понять та ідей.

Ця взаємодія семантичних категорій та мовних висловів має велике значення в контексті розуміння функціонування мови. Вона розглядається як ключовий аспект у формуванні значень слів та розкритті їх смислового потенціалу. Саме через цей взаємозв'язок мови та мислення можливе точне вираження ідей та відчуттів у словесній формі.

Інтерактивна динаміка між семантичними категоріями та мовною експресією виглядає особливо важливою в контексті функціонального підходу. У цьому підході семантичні категорії отримують функціонально-семантичний статус, оскільки їх розглядають як ключові елементи для передачі ідей та концепцій в межах мовного спілкування. Даний підхід базується на ідеї тісної взаємодії між семантичними категоріями, що визначають зміст, і мовними засобами, які служать для його вираження.

В результаті розвитку цієї концепції була визначена модель функціонально-семантичного поля. Сформульована модель функціонально-семантичного поля також є науковою новизною цього дослідження. Вона сприяє систематизації та узагальненню різноманітних аспектів взаємодії між мовними засобами та значеннями. Ця модель може відкривати нові можливості для дослідження мови, мислення та їх взаємозв'язку, вносячи цінний внесок у наукове співтовариство.

Ключові слова: мова, мислення, семантичні категорії, функціонально-семантичне поле.

Iryna RUDIK

PhD in Linguistics, associate professor at the Department of Foreign Languages for Humanities, Odesa I.I.Mechnikov National University, 24/26 Frantsuzkyi Blvd, Odesa, Ukraine, 65058
ORCID: 0000-0001-9208-4923

Maryna TER-GRYGORIAN

PhD in Linguistics, associate professor at the Department of Foreign Languages for Humanities, Odesa I.I.Mechnikov National University, 24/26 Frantsuzkyi Blvd, Odesa, Ukraine, 65058
ORCID: 0000-0001-7558-2533

To cite this article: Rudik, I., Ter-Grygorian M. (2023). Spivvidnesenist semantychnoi katehorii otsinky z riznorivnevymy zasobamy yii vyrazhennia [Correlation of the semantic category of evaluation with various levels of means for its expression]. *Current Issues of Foreign Philology*, 19, 75–79, doi: <https://doi.org/10.32782/2410-0927-2023-19-12>

CORRELATION OF THE SEMANTIC CATEGORY OF EVALUATION WITH VARIOUS LEVELS OF MEANS FOR ITS EXPRESSION

The article is aimed at an in-depth analysis of the relationship between language and thinking, focusing on one of the key theses – the existence of limited semantic categories that determine the meaning of words. It is noted that these semantic categories are always inextricably linked with specific linguistic means of each individual language. In this regard, these categories are considered as a complex network of different-level language expressions designed to accurately convey specific concepts and ideas.

This interaction of semantic categories and linguistic expressions is of great importance in the context of understanding the functioning of language. It is considered as a key aspect in forming the meanings of words and revealing their semantic potential. Because of this relationship between language and thinking that accurate expression of ideas and feelings in verbal form is possible.

This interactive dynamic between semantic categories and linguistic expression appears particularly important in the context of a functional approach. In this approach, semantic categories receive a functional-semantic status, as they are considered as key elements for the transfer of ideas and concepts within linguistic communication. This approach is based on the idea of a close interaction between the semantic categories that determine the content and the linguistic means that serve to express it.

As a result of the development of this concept, a model of the functional-semantic field was formulated. The formulated model of the functional-semantic field is also a scientific novelty of this research. It contributes to the systematization and generalization of various aspects of the interaction between linguistic means and meanings. This model can open up new possibilities for the study of language, thinking and their relationship, making a valuable contribution to the scientific community.

Key words: language, comprehension, semantic categories, functional-semantic field.

Problem statement. The issue of the cognitive basis of linguistic structures and their linguistic realizations is considered one of the most important in the modern linguistic paradigm. Language and thought, language and cognition, are so closely interconnected that many researchers in the fields of philosophy and linguistics consider it possible to speak of «language-thought» as a syncretic phenomenon, and they equate context and linguistic situation with human or societal experience (Костусяк, 2012, с. 123–152).

According to some researchers, "language not only reflects reality, it influences this reflection; it is a «window» in human consciousness" (Костусяк, 2012, с. 153–162).

Analysis of recent research and publications. Regarding the common interests of philosophy and linguistics in the field of semantics, R. Trask (Trask, 2012, p. 25–36) writes, emphasizing the idea that the problem of the relationship between language and thought has not yet been definitively resolved. The author points out that prominent British scholars like B. Russell, P. Strawson, D. Davidson; Pole O. Tarski; Americans W.V.O. Quine, R. Montague, D. Kau, and others have worked on this issue (Trask, 2012, p. 38–53).

Thus, in one of the recent works, questions of philosophy of language are developed alongside issues of meaning. The problem of establishing types and kinds of linguistic meanings emerged within the realm of linguistic-philosophical direc-

tion that studies the existence of universals, i.e. general concepts. Although philologists have dealt with issues of philosophy of language since ancient times, special attention was given to it in the late 19th century. German scholar G. Frege is considered the father of the philosophy of language. In the late 19th and early 20th centuries, authoritative philosophers expressed the view that language should be considered the primary object of philosophy as a science, while the analysis of the use of linguistic signs is a way to solve many philosophical problems. As a result, one of the objects of careful attention for researchers in philosophy and linguistics becomes semantics, the study of meaning. Just like linguists, philosophers are interested in how linguistic units relate to the real world and the world of concepts, how the meaning of an utterance depends on context, and the interaction between language and thought.

Within the realm of logical semantics, which has developed, two directions are distinguished – the theory of reference (the investigation of the relationship between linguistic expressions and designated objects) and the theory of sense (the investigation of the connection between the sense and denotation of an expression). The tasks of the research have determined the necessity to consider categorization – the mechanism of information extraction in thought structures, which involves grouping objects and phenomena into appropriate classes as categories of experi-

ence formed through human cognitive activity. The term «conceptual categories» was first introduced into scientific use by O. Jespersen. Recognizing the widespread characteristics of cognitive classifications, the linguist from Denmark held the viewpoint that alongside synthetic categories dependent on the structure of each language in the form in which it exists, there are also non-linguistic categories that do not depend on more or less random facts of existing languages.

A similar explanation of conceptual categories is given by S.D. Katsnelson «universal categories are primarily mental forms of logical origin. They form a system that serves as the underlying basis of language but is not directly part of it». (Костусяк, 2012, с. 170–200). However, labeling them purely logical wouldn't be accurate, as when examined within the framework of grammar, they exhibit specific features. By positing the existence of categories within the border area of «logical grammar», which also form a system, the scholar supports the thesis of the hierarchical nature of cognitive structures. This idea was previously suggested by I.I. Meshchaninov, who views conceptual categories as a connecting element that ultimately links linguistic material to the general order of human thinking, including logical and psychological categories. In this context, the logical framework of cognitive categories corresponds to specific linguistic units of various levels. Exploring this interrelation requires closer attention to the issue of meaning as a transitional link between conceptual categories and linguistic phenomena, enabling the use of linguistic code. (Костусяк, 2012, с. 213–252). Meanings are formed within the realm of semantic categories. Semantic categories are related to conceptual categories as variations of invariants. When researchers develop the thesis of semantic categories within the realm of grammar, they present them as invariant categorial features (semantic constants) that appear in various linguistic meanings expressed through different means such as morphological, syntactic, and even combined. Semantic categories become universal-linguistic, whereas conceptual categories are termed «universal-mental». Conceptual categories include logical and philosophical concepts like time, space, quality, quantity, object, subject. These universal cognitive categories always correspond to universal linguistic ones (aspectuality, temporality, etc.), which in

turn are related to specific linguistic categories of perfect or imperfect aspect, grammatical tense, etc. Since semantic categories are always linked to specific means of a particular language, researchers consider them alongside a complex of multilevel means of their expression in order to convey specific content. Within the functional approach, they attain the status of functional-semantic categories.

The **purpose** of the article is to analyze and define the semantic categories and functional-semantic categories. Thus, the functional-semantic category is defined as a feature of linguistic units of different levels that conceptually integrates them with linguistic units on the basis of general purpose. Formulated in accordance with the tasks and goals of the functional concept, the concept of FSC has gradually evolved: the principles of categorization of linguistic units based on the functions of grammatical categories have been replaced by conceptual and communicative criteria of categorization. Modern FSC concepts take into account the integration of conceptual, linguistic and communicative aspects of function. In accordance with their mental and linguistic nature, FSCs integrate the implicit meanings of linguistic units and communicatively determined meanings in the respective categorial situations. FSCs are far from being isomorphic to formal logical ones, although they can be correlated with fragments of logical categorization. They are only partially based on grammatical categories, which is why their terminological designation is not identical. The result of the development of the FSC concept is the model of the functional semantic field (hereinafter referred to as the FSF). By FSF it is meant bilateral semantic and formal unities formed by grammatical units, classes and categories together with the multilevel linguistic means that interact with them.

The outline of the main research material. The integrity of the FSP is ensured by the fact that the content of the field is based on a certain semantic category. As for the means of formal expression (grammatical, lexical-grammatical, lexical), their totality lacks integrity, since they belong to different language levels. Among the advantages of the FSN model are "strong" systemic features.

One of them is the functional completeness of the field, which covers the entire range of functions based on a particular semantic category. (Fodor, 1995, p. 112).

The second "strong" systemic feature of the FSP is the absence of restrictions on the nature and type of formal means covered by this phenomenon, since the semantic category underlying this unity can be expressed by any linguistic units. Among the ways of expressing the semantics of the field are discrete, explicit and implicit, direct and indirect, linguistic and a combination of linguistic means and elements of the linguistic situation. The FSP has its own structure: within the field, micro fields are distinguished as varieties of invariant content consisting of a center (core or dominant) and a periphery. Classifying features form the core of the field, and characterizing features form its periphery. The core of the field contains the differential feature and is "the aspect of isolating among grammatical units and categories everything that influences them, feels their influence". As for the periphery, it implies "the aspect of the hierarchy of field components in terms of the features of the most specialized and regular expression of the semantic category that underlies a given FSP. The peculiarity of peripheral features is their relative characteristic status, i.e. the same feature can be a characteristic feature in a given semantic category and a core feature for another semantic category. Structural types of FSP are represented by monocentric and polycentric fields. The first type has an integral or heterogeneous grammatical core, i.e., it is based on a grammatical category that has the most striking feature of the field and a set of standardized means of expression.

The second, polycentric, type of field is characterized by the division into several spheres, each of which has its own center and peripheral components. The structure of the FSP in different languages differs depending on the type of language and the grammaticalization of meanings (Taylor, 2002, p. 324).

Various speech acts are being examined and specific aspects of speech acts are being revealed: characteristics of different types of modal situations, including imperative statements, reliability, unreliability, modality of nominative constructs, temporal reference of directive statements, taxonomic relations in a series of homogeneity, aspectual-temporal characteristics of statements, and so

on. Due to the fact that the modeling of speech acts is not solely aimed at redistributing linguistic resources based on their static functions but is also oriented towards the linguistic sphere, contextual and situational functions of linguistic units, implicit and ambivalent meanings, and so forth are involved in the space of speech acts. In functional grammar, the question of defining the features of the center (dominant) and periphery of speech acts is considered to be a subject of debate.

Some researchers propose such criteria for identifying the dominant as the greatest specialization in terms of expressing meaning, unambiguity and systematic use; others consider the center to be the area of the most complete and explicit realization of a certain meaning, characterized by maximum vividness, regularity of expression, stylistic neutrality and a lower degree of dependence on contextual conditions.

Conclusions. The application of the FSP theory to utterances has led to the differentiation of the field centers: predicate, subject-object, qualitative-quantitative, and circumstantial. At the same time, the dominant feature is the invariant composition of the sentence members.

The field of periphery is characterized by weakened content, irregularity of form, implicitness, anomalies, asymmetry, and ambivalence. There is a distinction between the near, middle and far periphery of the FSP.

Thus, the key characteristics of FSP are:

a) multidimensional semantics of the FSP components, which is manifested in the presence of many functions of the field components, which are in a relationship of mutual complementarity and correlate with one semantic category;

b) multilevel and diffuseness, which is manifested in the absence of integrity and homogeneity in terms of expression;

c) systemacity, which is manifested in the interaction of the FSP with other fields, that is, in its inclusion in a whole complex of overlapping systems.

The above properties explain the functionality of the FSP model, its application to the semantic and functional-semantic analysis of both linguistic facts and products of speech activity, and the content of discourse.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

1. Великий тлумачний словник сучасної української мови. / за ред. В.Т.Бусел. Київ; Ірпінь, 2009. 1736 с. URL: <https://sum.in.ua>
2. Костусяк Н. Структура міжрівневих категорій сучасної української мови: монографія. Луцьк. 2012. 454 с.
3. Липка С.І. Лексико-семантичне поле на позначення зухвалої поведінки в сучасній німецькій мові: дис... канд. філол. наук:10.02.04. Львів. 2013. С. 78–83.
4. Селіванова О.О. Лінгвістична енциклопедія. Довкілля-К. 2011. С. 844.
5. Тарасова Е.В. Теорія мовленнєвої акомодатії та проблеми керування дискурсом. Вчені зап. Харків. гуманітар. ун-ту «Нар.укр.акад.». Харків. 2018. Т. 24. С. 301–308.
6. Dictionary by Merriam-Webster: America's most-trusted online. URL:<http://www.merriam-webster.com>
7. Fodor J. The Elm and the Expert. Mentalese and its Semantics. London. Mit Press. 1995. 128 p.
8. Taylor J.R. Cognitive Grammar. New York. Oxford University Press. 2002. 612 p.
9. Trask R.L. Why do languages change? Cambridge University Press. 2012. 198c.

REFERENCES:

1. Velykyi tлумachnyi slovnyk suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy. (2009) / za red. V.Busel. Kyiv; Irpin. 1736. URL: <https://sum.in.ua>
2. Kostusiak N. (2012). Struktura mizhrivnevnykh katehorii suchasnoi ukrainskoi movy [The structure of interlevel categories of the modern Ukrainian language]. Lutsk. 454.
3. Lypka S. (2013). Leksyko-semantychnе pole na poznachennia zukhvaloі povedinky v suchasniі nimetskii movi [Lexical-semantic field for the designation of impudent behavior in the modern German language]. *Extended abstract of candidate's thesis*. 10.02.04. Lviv. 78–83.
4. Selivanova O. (2011). Linhvistychna entsyklopediia. [Ligustic encyclopedia]. Dovkillia-K. 844.
5. Tarasova E.V. (2018). Teoriia movlennievoi akomodatsii ta problemy keruvannia dyskursom. [Theory of speech accommodation and problems of discourse management]. Kharkiv. V. 24. 301–308.
6. Dictionary by Merriam-Webster: America's most-trusted online. URL:<http://www.merriam-webster.com>
7. Fodor J. (1995) The Elm and the Expert. Mentalese and its Semantics. London. Mit Press. 128.
8. Taylor J.R. (2002) Cognitive Grammar. New York. Oxford University Press. 612.
9. Trask R.L. (2012). Why do languages change? Cambridge University Press. 198.