

## COGNITIVE PRAGMATIC REGULARITIES IN COMMUNICATIVE MANIFESTATION OF POSITIVE EVALUATION

*Natalia Bigunova*

*Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University, Odesa, Ukraine*

### **Bibliographic description:**

Bigunova, N. (2019). Cognitive pragmatic regularities in communicative manifestation of positive evaluation. In *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. ISSN 2453-8035 DOI: <https://doi.org/10.34135/lartis.19.4.1.01>

**Abstract:** The article focuses on the pragmatic peculiarities of evaluative cognitive judgment formation and its transformation into an evaluative communicative utterance. The article provides a positive evaluative taxonomy of approval, praise, compliment, and flattery speech acts, functioning in English literary discourse and film discourse. The illocutionary aims, evaluation objects and themes, as well as the perlocutionary effect of approval, praise, compliment, and flattery speech acts have been outlined.

**Key words:** evaluation, evaluative judgment vs evaluative utterance, literary discourse, film discourse, speech act, approval, praise, compliment, flattery.

### **1. Introduction**

Evaluation has received the status of a universal cognitive category that affects all spheres of human being and thinking. This fact generates an increased interest of contemporary linguists in the issues of evaluation processes. In the present paper an attempt has been made to study the cognitive pragmatic properties and regularities of communicative manifestation of positive evaluation in English literary and film discourse.

The category of evaluation has been defined as a pragmatic and semantic category represented by evaluative units at all speech levels. Typically, these evaluative units convey positive, negative, or ambivalent speaker's attitude to the message content. They aim to realise a communicative intention and achieve some perlocutionary effect (Prihodko 2016).

The functional semantics of evaluation has been thoroughly investigated by Bulygina & Shmelev (Бульгина & Шмелев 1997), Ivin (Ивин 1970), Martin & White (2005), and Volf (Вольф 2006). The speech realization and pragmatic relevance of evaluation have been analysed by Ananko (2017), Byessonova (Бессонова 2002), Hunston & Thompson (2001), Kolegaeva & Strochenko (2018), Myroniuk (2017), Prihodko (2016), Samokhina & Pasynok (2017), Zagraevskaya (Заграевская 2006).

However, there are certain gaps in researching the mechanism of transforming an evaluative cognitive judgment into an evaluative utterance. The relevance of the present study is determined by the fact that the evaluative cognitive process and the speech realization of evaluation demand further development. In the proposed conception, the category of evaluation is interpreted as the key cognitive and communicative category that correlates with the sociopragmatic characteristics of the communicants and determines their speech behaviour, serving as the starting point of a speech act. When analyzing a particular instance of the speech realization of evaluation, a researcher should take into consideration who is expressing evaluation, who the addressee is, in what extralinguistic context it is happening, what the speaker's aims are, whether they are achieved or not, what the communicants' social status is, and how sincere they are.

It is with the feeling of this need to probe more deeply into the area of evaluation production that this brief study has been prepared focusing on the pragmatic peculiarities of cognitive judgment formation and its transformation into a communicative utterance.

The **subject** of the discussion is manifestation of positive evaluation in English literary discourse and film discourse.

## **2. Methodology**

The major **aim** of this study is to formulate the research methodology of a new

linguistic branch – Cognitive Communicative Axiology of Reproduced Discourse. There is also a need to devise a taxonomy of positive evaluative speech acts functioning in literary discourse and film discourse. This task involves integral research into the illocutionary aims and the perlocutionary effect of positive evaluative speech acts. Among the positive evaluative speech acts, compliment speech acts have been most thoroughly studied (Бессонова 2003; Серебрякова 2002; Altani 1991; Herbert 1989; Holmes 1988; Manes 1983; Wolfson 1983; etc.) but they are still confused with praise speech acts, investigated predominantly by Russian and Ukrainian linguists (Клочко 2003; Конова 1992) in terms of their evaluation objects. Flattery has also become the object of predominantly Eastern European investigations (Дорда 2007; Петелина 1988). Approval is least explored (Кабанкова 2011; Ярошевич 2003), and it is frequently confused with praise and compliment. Thus, there is a clear need to identify the evaluation objects, the evaluation themes, and the degree of sincerity of all the above acts.

The **material** under analysis is represented by 1,400 speech episodes taken from English literary discourse in which the characters express positive evaluation of certain objects. The other data set includes 700 episodes taken from film discourse, in which the characters express positive evaluation.

The pragmatic aspect of the episodes has been analysed with the help of certain linguistic **approaches**, as well as general and special linguistic **methods**. Since the process of communication cannot be fully described without covering the cognitive processes that occur in the communicants' minds during speech production and speech perception, the exploration of the relevant linguistic and extralinguistic properties of evaluative communication is seen as a vitally important task. Obviously, neither a merely communicative analysis of evaluative discourse, nor a merely cognitive analysis of evaluative discourse, chosen separately, cannot provide such an opportunity. Here is a good reason for using a combination of the communicative and cognitive paradigms while analysing evaluation contexts. A complete and thorough

explanation of evaluative processes can be made with the help of **the Cognitive Discourse Approach**, offered by Kubryakova (Кубрякова 1986; 2005), which allows for the interpretation of evaluative patterns from the point of view of the cognitive and communicative functions they perform.

The linguistic analysis of the selected data has been based on the application of **general scientific methods**, namely: the methods of synthesis and analysis that promoted the holistic research into the literary discourse; the method of observation that enabled the identification of the peculiar characteristics of the investigated data; the descriptive method that was helpful in establishing the variant and invariant characteristics of the collected evidence; **special linguistic methods**, namely: the contextual-interpretational method was used to identify the pragmatic properties of the speech realization of evaluation, the communicants' implicit and explicit intentions, presuppositions, their background knowledge, conventions, and evaluative stereotypes in each communicative situation; the cognitive discourse analysis was used to describe the cognitive processes that precede the verbalization of evaluation in a certain type of discourse; the componential analysis was helpful in establishing how a certain positive evaluative meaning becomes highlighted in speech due to certain language means.

Evaluation is seen as a cognitive operation, which presupposes the use of two types of knowledge: the knowledge of the evaluated object and the knowledge of the evaluator's own inner needs.

### **3. The correlation between an evaluative cognitive judgment and an evaluative utterance**

#### *3.1 Evaluation as a cognitive process in a person's mind*

According to Selivanova, evaluation as a psychological mechanism, which still remains open to debate, implies projecting evaluation upon cognitive or sensory-emotional processes (Селиванова 2010: 525).

There is no need to prove the fact that any utterance is conditioned by a number of extralinguistic situations. An utterance is plunged into macro- and microcontext and is determined by the worldview that is created during a person's life. The essential prerequisites for context formation are known to be the communicative situation, the communicants' experience and knowledge, their intentions in regard to each other, their status and role characteristics, the topic of conversation, mental and physical states, as well as certain cultural and social phenomena that determine the content realization of an utterance. All these factors are reflected in the speaker's evaluative attitude to the environment and the interlocutor.

It should be noted that evaluation is characterized by selectivity: it extracts and retains the features that are important from the evaluation subject's point of view. The very fact of the evaluation process gives evidence that the object of evaluation seems valuable for a certain subject, and so it gets into the subject's zone of concern. One and the same object can be of interest to one subject and can leave another subject uninterested. From a multitude of various objects people evaluate those, which are significant for them at a given moment, and those that provoke their emotions. If an object has not attracted the attention of a certain subject, no evaluation will be produced: neither in mind nor in speech.

Undoubtedly, evaluation as a cognitive process in a person's mind occurs on an on-going basis, while expression of evaluation in speech occurs by far less frequently. A wish or reluctance to produce speech evaluation is determined by a set of pragmatic factors. If an evaluative speech act takes place, it will not always equal an evaluative cognitive judgment (as to its intensity, or even its positive or negative character).

There is an opposition "evaluation – non-evaluation". If an object gets into a subject's zone of concern, the process of evaluating is sure to take place, and thus positive, negative, or mixed evaluation is produced.

Furthermore, foregrounding of neutral evaluation may be refuted. If a certain subject states their neutral or indifferent attitude to a certain object, it suggests rather a negative attitude. As Vorkachyov puts it, in case a speaker says he/she is indifferent to an object, it implies a certain neglect or contempt (Воркачев 2006: 106).

Bearing in mind these observations, on no account should evaluation be classified into positive, negative, and neutral types. Evaluation cannot be neutral. If a person states his or her neutral attitude, he or she expresses latent negative evaluation.

Thus, the position of the norm as an accepted standard on the intensity scale clearly has to be reconsidered. My own view is that the norm does not occupy the scale centre but its positive pole; thus, the evaluation scale functions in language as an asymmetric one. "Good" means corresponding to the norm, as well as indicating the qualitative enhancement of an evaluated feature, while "bad" means deviation from the norm in the direction of decreasing.

It has been long reported in the academic literature that the process of evaluation includes the following stages: delimitation of the essential characteristics of an evaluation object, identification of a problematic area, establishing the object's discrete characteristics, choice of evaluation criteria, the criteria assessment, and elaboration of the evaluative characteristics of the chosen criteria (Вольф 2006; Ananko 2017; Prihodko 2016). Following the evaluation judgment creation stage there might be a stage aimed at choosing evaluation devices, either verbal (lexical, grammatical, stylistic) or non-verbal, thus, an evaluative judgment may get transformed into an inner or outer speech utterance.

### *3.2 The transformation of an evaluative cognitive judgment into an evaluative utterance*

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; it is considered that any person directs his/her evaluative activity towards the objects qualified as valuable for him or her. Nevertheless, it is noteworthy that there occur sometimes 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.

One should also keep in mind 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? My answer is: the second option. 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 suggest 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 ≠ EU in terms of their "+ / -" character (EJ is negatively coloured ("-" icon), while EU is positively coloured ("+" icon), or vice versa);
- 3) EJ ≠ EU as to the degree of intensity (EJ is a rational positive evaluation, EU is an exaggerated emotional evaluation);
- 4) EJ → no EU;
- 5) no EJ → EU as a ritual communicative act (Бігунова 2017: 63).

Besides, the sense of an utterance, presupposed by a speaker, may be misinterpreted by an addressee. A language meaning incorporates such elements, as content basis and interpretation component that are closely linked, but, nevertheless, should be differentiated in a particular speech situation (Бондарко 1996: 6). Consequently, it is important to take notice of how the recipient of a positive evaluation takes the evaluative utterance – as sincere/insincere, relevant/irrelevant, etc.

Furthermore, not every evaluation formed in a person's mind becomes transformed into an adequate utterance. For instance, 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 will not become verbally or non-verbally explicit if the evaluation subject is jealous of the evaluation object or angry at them, or follows some pragmatic guidelines.

Thus, 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.

#### **4. Speech realization of evaluation in literary and film discourse**

This research is focused on evaluation realization regularities in literary discourse, as well as in film discourse.

#### *4.1 Fiction vs real communication*

Undoubtedly, all fiction created by man in natural language is a verbal representation of a fictional world, but the procedures applied in fiction correspond to natural language operations, and in this respect fiction resembles a prototypical representation of metalanguage (Кубрякова 1986: 104).

Any fictional work intending to express a certain content, embodies its conception by means of the play of the actors who articulate this or that text – a fragment of the discourse as a speech-cognitive activity, which is "sunk in life" (Арутюнова 1988: 136), or as a language activity, set in certain pragmatic conditions, and also demanding interpretation in a rather sophisticated coordinate system (Демьянков 2005; Кубрякова 2005).

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: 5).

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).

In literary discourse, dialogue is aimed at creating the effect of objectiveness and authenticity of events, as the author tries to refrain from the description and evaluation of the events, delegating this function to the speaking hero.

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.

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.

Page has written a valuable study of dialogue in literature. He concludes his analysis of the "reality-status" of such a dialogue by noting that:

*... for various reasons it seems overwhelmingly likely that no dialogue in a novel or play will consist merely, or even mainly, of an accurate transcript of spontaneous speech. It is important to insist at this point that there is an inevitable gap – wider or narrower at different times, but never disappearing entirely – between speech . . . and even the most "realistic" dialogue in a world of literature (1973: 7).*

The same applies to film discourse.

*Film discourse*, seen as a coherent text (the verbal component of a film) along with an audio-visual system and other significant extralinguistic factors (Зарецкая 2010), has also served as a resource of factual data for the present paper. As well as in literary discourse, film discourse features explicit and implicit information. The implicit information is conveyed to the spectator via verbal and non-verbal means, and also through specific film means, such as text layout over a moving icon, an offscreen voice, and providing the spectators with offscreen metatextual commentary.

Film text and film dialogue have been defined as film discourse constituents, structural-linear, strongly determined, fixed, conditioned in time, differentiated by the intermixing and overlapping verbal and visual components according to the author's conception, characterized by reproduction multiplicity in the same form and, thus, by predictability (Колодина 2013).

Film dialogue is seen as "a verbal component of a feature film, whose conceptual completeness is guaranteed by an audiovisual system in a film discourse" (Горшкова 2006: 77).

It goes without saying that film dialogue is different from real communication. It is characterized by duality: it is never spontaneous but it should seem so. It is permanent but must appear to be as ephemeral as the speech it imitates. Film dialogue is aimed at creating an impression that the actor says what in reality he recites. In sharing the convention, the film audience also has a share in the film discourse duplicity. Kozloff, addressing the problems of a drama dialogue, points that:

*"we (the film goers – N.B.) simultaneously accept the illusion of spontaneity and know that it is a pretense. For it is not the hearing of the words by the interlocutor that completes the exchange, as it is in everyday speech, but the witnessing and interpreting of both the utterance and the response by the audience. Much of the particular effect of drama derives from the gap between two ways of hearing, that of the interlocutor on stage and that of the audience, and from the audience's consciousness of the gap. The audience sets each utterance beside each previous utterance made within the limited time span of the play and, in doing so, catches implications beyond those immediately relevant to speaker and interlocutor"* (2000: 17).

Film dialogue may strive mightily to imitate natural conversation, but it is always an imitation:

*"It has been scripted, written and rewritten, censored, polished, rehearsed, and performed. Even when lines are improvised on the set, they have been spoken by impersonators, judged, approved, and allowed to remain. Then all dialogue is recorded, edited, mixed, underscored, and played through stereophonic speakers with Dolby sound. The actual hesitations, repetitions, digressions, grunts, interruptions, and mutterings of everyday speech have either been pruned away, or, if not, deliberately included"* (ibid., 18).

In agreement with Lakoff and Tannen, the present study claims that "artificial dialog may represent an internalized model or schema for the production of conversation – a competence model that speakers have access to" (1984: 323).

Essentially, both literary dialogue and film dialogue are contrived (by the endeavours of the scriptwriter, film maker, and the actors) as the imitation of real life dialogue.

#### 4.2 Markers of evaluation in reproduced discourse

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 in literary discourse and the off-screen voice explaining the character's attitude in film discourse.

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 Anne listens carefully to Andrew, asks appropriate questions and tells jokes. Andrew's non-verbal behaviour (*he grinned*) and his inner speech reveal his positive evaluation of Anne's sense of humour, even though he doesn't express it out loud:

*He grinned and nodded. It seemed she had a good sense of humour. That earned her a second tick of approval* (A.D. Parsons "The call on high country", p. 46).

In another novel, the heroine did not like the talk at dinner, which she did not voice either, but the reader gets to know about it from her inner speech, provided by the author:

*I was glad when the meal was over and we were outside in the sunshine again* (B. Pym "A glass of blessings", p. 22).

Hamish, a policeman, who is about to question a young girl, perceives her as very attractive, which the reader comes to know from the author's description of Hamish's thoughts. Nevertheless, Hamish does not voice his positive evaluative judgment: it will not be appropriate in formal communication:

*Melissa swung round, saw Hamish's uniform, and turned pale.*

*"It's all right," he said easily. "I am not going to question you at the moment." She had beautiful eyes, he noticed, well spaced and dark grey. He thought her pink hair suited her. "Did Blair give you a hard time?" he asked (M.C. Beaton "Death of a prankster", p. 51).*

The next episode from the same novel serves to illustrate a positive evaluative judgment, which remains unexpressed for other reasons. Lesley is having dinner in a restaurant with Hamish, who is handsome and unmarried. She has worked out a plan how to seduce him. Suddenly, a beauty comes into the restaurant and joins them. She turns out to be a friend of Hamish's. Lesley's inner speech informs the reader of her perception of Priscilla as a beauty, but Lesley does not compliment on the girl's appearance as she treats her as a rival:

*Hamish introduced Priscilla to Lesley. Lesley's heart sank. **Who on earth was this classy vision, impeccably dressed, serene and beautiful? Her face was perfect, as was the smooth bell of her blonde hair.** Lesley had drunk a lot so that she would have the excuse of asking Hamish for a bed for the night. It was still worth a try.*

*"I'm afraid I'm not in a fit condition to drive this evening," she said.*

*"Don't worry about it," said Priscilla. "I'll put you up at the hotel as my guest." All Lesley could do was to say dismally, "Very kind of you" (M.C. Beaton "Death of a witch", p. 94).*

Positive evaluation becomes manifested in the characters' inner speech and in the author's comment by means of positive evaluative lexemes: *glad, like, admire, enjoy, pleased, etc.:*

- *He smiled. He felt unusually well. Penelope had begged him to slow down on his drinking, and he only had a couple of pints the evening before. He was **pleased** with Penelope. The money was good, and this detective series would make her name (M.C. Beaton "Death of a scriptwriter", p. 36).*
- *Hamish **admired** her sturdy legs as she walked out of the kitchen (ibid., p. 125).*

It is noteworthy that the subject of evaluation is not always sure whether his/her evaluation is positive or negative: an object of evaluation can evoke mixed feelings, as it is in a speech situation depicting Wilmet's response to the news about Father Ramson's staying at their place. Her positive evaluation of the news results in the use of the word *amused* and her negative evaluation of the same news gets explicit by the use of the word *annoyed*:

*I was **both annoyed and amused** at her news, **annoyed** because for some reason I did not want him to live at the Beamishes, and **amused** at the picture of him cooking his own breakfast on a gas ring* (B. Pym "A glass of blessings", p. 41).

Etiquette regulations, a wish to save "one's face" prevent a communicant from expressing his/her negative evaluation: a communicant may keep silent, or soften a negative evaluative statement, or even express an opposite evaluative statement. For example, a wife tries to conceal her displeasure at her husband's behaviour. He has spent a couple of hours with their child and has performed some routine actions, and boasts about them. Out loud she expresses praise but her genuine feelings become explicit from her inner speech:

*"Already fed and watered," Tom says proudly, like he's conquered a small continent rather than just done the thing I do every day without comment. "I took him out."*

*"**Great**," I say, although a little part of me thinks, "damn" (P. Williams "How to be married", p. 46).*

The mismatching of an evaluative judgment and an evaluative utterance is also 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**" (J. Highmore "The birthday", p. 130).*

As Hamish, the protagonist in a series of M.C. Beaton's novels, wittily remarks, "luckily, not all the things inside one's head get to the outside", in such a way he himself forms a positive evaluative judgment, which does not become voiced:

*Hamish had a sudden image of Blair being blasted to death by a shotgun and he smiled. It was great that some of the things inside his head never got to the outside, he thought* (M.C. Beaton "Death of a witch", p. 112).

The audiovisual aspect of film discourse becomes enhanced due to the non-verbal behaviour of characters in reproduced communication. Facial expression, body movements, and gestures indicate the sincerity/insincerity of evaluative utterances, as well as their degree of intensity.

In the film "Love actually", there is an episode depicting exchange of presents by members of a family. The husband (played by Alan Rickman) and the wife (Emma Thompson) are middle-aged and have been married for quite a long time. They have two children. The wife knows that in his office a young and pretty secretary is flirting with him. The day before Emma warned her husband against that cheeky young girl. Besides, the viewers know that the secretary would like Alan to give her a Christmas present. Just before dinner the husband and wife had been shopping and Emma noticed her husband buying something at the jewelry store. On coming home, she searched his pockets and found a pendant and a necklace. Judging by Emma's joyful face expression, the viewers think she reckons the present is meant for her. Such are the presumptions and implications of the present exchange moment. When Emma eventually tears the wrappings of her present, her expectations are stirred up by Alan: *This is slightly special. Personal* (Film "Love actually", 1.32 min).

At last, the wrappings are torn:

*To my brilliant wife!* (ibid., 1.34 min).

There is a disk with retro music inside. Emma desperately tries to conceal her disappointment and despair. She says:

*Goodness! That's great!* (ibid., 1.35 min).

Emma smiles, hugs her husband. The diversity of the uttered positive evaluation of the gift and the evaluative judgment formed in Emma's mind (which is obviously negative) gets explicit by means of a long pause, panic in Emma's eyes, shifty eyes, and her hand raised to the forehead, which is known as a sign of perplexity. And finally, to persuade the viewers of the complete discrepancy between the approving utterance and the true state of things, Emma is shown apologizing and leaving the room. She goes to another room and gives rein to her passions for some time: she cries bitterly. Thus, the discrepancy of the uttered positive evaluation and the evaluative judgment becomes obvious to viewers of film by means of presuppositions, implications, background knowledge of the speech situation, as well as by virtue of non-verbal means.

Here is an example of a negative evaluative judgment, which completely contradicts the cognitive evaluative judgment of film discourse heroes. Monica and Chandler, sitcom "Friends" characters, are talking at the wedding reception. They have spent their first night together. Their eyes are shining; they are overwhelmed with feelings, but avoid looking at each other. Both of them refer to the previous night as a "crazy and stupid" act, which is obviously not what they are feeling and then they decide on meeting again:

*Chandler: What we did last night was...*

*Monica: **Stupid!***

*Chandler: **Totally crazy and stupid!***

*Monica: What were we thinking?!*

*Chandler: I'll come over tonight, all right?*

*Monica: Oh, yeah. Definitely! (Sitcom "Friends", 13.30.04).*

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, Honey has to assure Paige who is doing her best to look nice on her first date:

*Saturday, Paige managed to get to a beauty salon. She went shopping and splurged on*

*a new dress.*

*"Do I look all right? Do you think he'll like it?"*

*"**You look sensational!**"* Honey assured her (S. Sheldon "Nothing lasts forever", p. 30).

In certain circumstances, communicants use evaluative utterances as a means of skirting a topic, which is harmful to their "faces", or a means of softening refusal or criticism, thus saving the interlocutor's "face". To illustrate a realized necessity of producing an evaluative utterance as a stage preceding the speech production of evaluation, here is an episode depicting a husband complimenting on his wife's cooking because he dislikes the turn the conversation is taking. Thus, a positive evaluative utterance helps the speaker to skirt an undesirable topic:

*'One of the reasons for living here is to be involved.'*

*'Not in everything. Not so that you are so tired you can't see straight.'*

*She said, looking at him hard, 'But I don't think it's that.'*

*Visibly he flinched. She saw his mind tiptoe away from the turn the conversation was taking, a turn he could not bear. He waved his fork at her.*

*'**Frightfully good, this,**'* he said (J. Trollope "A village affair", p. 68).

The next episode serves as an illustration of using a positive evaluative utterance to avoid refusal and to get from the interlocutor exactly what the speaker wants, namely to get rid of an intrusive girl and to make her call a colleague of hers:

*'What do you like to do, Myron?'*

*'Do?'*

*'For fun.'*

*'Look, Tawny, **you seem very nice, really,** but can I talk to the girl in the ad?'*  
(H. Coben "Deal breaker", p. 15).

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).

The pragmatic reasons why an evaluative judgment made by a character does not correspond to his/her evaluative utterance are identical to those in real communication: following the etiquette, a wish to save the speaker's own "face" and the "face" of the interlocutor, sticking to the rituals, 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. 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 (J. Trollope "Marrying the mistress", 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.

On the other hand, a positive evaluative utterance can get hyperbolic, especially if the communicant is involved in a speech ritual. Positive evaluation can also serve as a communicative tactics, used by speakers to meet their own (but, in fact, designed by the author) aims.

## **5. Positive evaluative speech acts taxonomy**

The theory of speech acts has proved that words are not used just to say things, i.e. describe states of affairs, but rather to do things actively (Austin 1962; Searle 1969; Strawson 1967; Wierzbicka 1991). The focus of the speech act theory has been on utterances, especially those made in conversational and other face-to-face situations.

A speech act has been defined as "a basic minimal unit of verbal communication, an intentionally and situationally determined, as well as grammatically and semantically organised utterance, that is accompanied by corresponding actions of the speaker, which are directed at the addressee and his reaction" (Селіванова 2010: 425).

In my view, positive evaluation becomes communicatively expressed in approval, praise, compliment, and flattery speech acts. There is a clear need to provide the reasons for uniting them in one class alongside identifying their illocutionary aims and perlocutionary effect as well as differentiating their objects, themes, and addresser-addressee relationship.

### *5.1 Approval, praise, compliment, and flattery speech acts: Illocutionary aims*

I consider approval, praise, compliment, and flattery speech acts to be syncretic illocutionary speech acts, as they simultaneously realize two or more illocutions, among which major and minor illocutions should be distinguished in a certain communicative exchange. However, their incorporation in the taxonomy is justified by the fact that their major illocutionary aim is to express positive evaluation of certain people, things, state of affairs, or ideas. The perlocutionary aim of an evaluative utterance is to persuade the addressee to agree with the speaker's judgment.

Another common aim of positive evaluative speech acts, which is presupposed by their expressive character, is a desire to make a positive emotional impact upon the addressee and to create a favourable conversation atmosphere. In case the addressee and the evaluation object is one and the same person, the speaker aims to encourage the listener to behave in the same way as he/she did before.

Moreover, positive evaluative utterances are manifestations of politeness and courtesy, and they are often parts of a communicative ritual, thus they serve to express speech etiquette. They realize positive politeness strategies aimed at demonstrating concern to the interlocutor, as well as negative politeness strategies presupposed by the wish to avoid the obstruction of the interlocutor's freedom of action.

The comparative analysis of illocutionary aims of positive evaluative speech acts in literary discourse allows for identifying in literary discourse has been helpful to identify the following APPROVAL speech act illocutionary aims:

- 1) the intention to express the speaker's emotional state by referring to the object's features as being adequate/good;
- 2) the intention to establish contact with the interlocutor and to make a positive emotional impact on them;
- 3) the intention to mitigate refusal or criticism and thus save the interlocutor's face;
- 4) the intention to change an undesirable topic and thus save the speaker's own face.

To illustrate the last point, here is a situation in which a refusal is preceded by an approval of the idea to go to Italy:

*"Why don't you come to Italy with us?" Jerry asks Rose.*

*She looks at Julia standing in abject silence behind Jerry. "That would be nice, dear, but I couldn't leave your father"* (R.C. Jones "Ten seconds from the sun", p. 69).

The illocutionary aims pursued by PRAISE speech act addressers are largely determined by the fact whether the interlocutor and the object of praise are one and the same person. If they are, the illocutionary aims of PRAISE speech act are the following:

- 1) the intention to qualify the evaluation object's actions or features as being adequate/good;
- 2) the intention to comfort and reassure the recipient, who is the object of evaluation, as well as to "save his/her face".

If the speaker praises a person who is not present at the moment of speech and thus the interlocutor is the recipient of a message, but not an object of praise, praise is still aimed at qualifying the evaluation object's actions or features as being adequate/good (1), but it also implies:

- 3) the intention to defend the third person, who is the object of evaluation, from the interlocutor's negative evaluative statements.

Here is a situation from a literary discourse illustrating the latter point: the speaker praises the third person, trying to save her face, the praise speech act being combined with the reproach speech act:

*"It's no good, Simon," Alan said. "You can't write her off as a gold-digger or a marriage-wrecker or a legal groupie or a sex bomb. You can't write Dad off, either, as a classic male menopause victim wanting to reassure himself he could still double the world's population if he wanted to. **She's the real thing. She's a proper person**"* (J. Trollope "Marrying the mistress", p. 85).

As for COMPLIMENT speech act, it is argued that it is aimed at establishing solidarity between the speaker and the recipient (Herbert 1989; Holmes 1988; Manes 1983; Wolfson 1983 and others). Manes states that, by offering compliments, the speaker expresses approval or admiration for the listener, and that solidarity between interlocutors thus is established (1983: 98). Wierzbicka remarks that compliments are

usually intended to make others feel good and are performed for maintaining "good interpersonal relationships" (1991: 87). Wolfson suggests that compliments can be considered social lubricants that serve to "create or maintain rapport" (1983: 88).

I regard the illocutionary aims of COMPLIMENT speech acts as follows:

- 1) the intention to show the hearer kindness, to do them a courtesy or to reassure them, which is caused by politeness strategies or a wish to maintain good interpersonal relationships with them;
- 2) the intention to express the speaker's emotional state by qualifying the evaluation object's features as being adequate/good (the object of evaluation being the interlocutor or the people who are close to him/her);
- 3) the intention to express gratitude to the addressee for their actions;
- 4) the intention to comfort and reassure the object of evaluation, "save his/her face".

The former two of the listed aims are invariably present in compliment speech acts, while the latter two aims are determined by the extralinguistic context and are not always present in the compliment structure.

Thus, praise presupposes a certain impact upon the recipient, it stimulates his/her active behaviour. This act is felicitous if it is accepted by the addressee, while the main intention behind the compliment is to report the speaker's positive feelings and favour towards the addressee. The imperative semantics is less significant here; it is more important to say something pleasant and to become closer to the interlocutor.

The illocutionary aims pursued by FLATTERY speech act addressers who admit to their status or role dependence upon the addressee are the following:

- 1) the pseudosincere intention to please the addressee, to improve their emotional state by qualifying their own (or their relatives') traits or actions as being good;
- 2) the intention to persuade the addressee of the addresser's sincerity;
- 3) the latent intention to gain benefit, material or immaterial;

- 4) the latent intention to encourage the addressee to do things that are beneficial for the addresser.

## *5.2 Approval, praise, compliment, and flattery speech acts: Evaluation objects and themes*

In the course of dealing with the research data I made an attempt to define approval, praise, compliment, and flattery speech acts in view of their evaluation objects, the correspondence between the recipient and the evaluation object, and their evaluation themes.

It should be clarified that an *evaluation subject* means a person who expresses evaluation, an *evaluation object* is a person or a thing that become evaluated, and an *evaluation theme* is the feature of a certain object which is evaluated.

I refer all the speech acts under analysis to expressive speech acts since they are aimed at "expressing the speaker's feelings about themselves or the world" (Searle 1969: 45).

I regard APPROVAL as a positive evaluative expressive syncretic speech act, its evaluation object being things, ideas, and phenomena that do not refer to the addressee's sphere of interests. The latter fact makes approval different from the other evaluative speech acts. Another difference lies in the fact that the recipient and the evaluation object of approval never overlap. Approval evaluation theme is that feature of the evaluated objects, which attracts the addresser's attention. These features are determined by the speaker's evaluative stereotypes and presuppositions. Here is an episode in which the speaker is asked to explain a certain notion. She does not only explain that a woman's clothes brand is meant but also evaluates it positively, thus creating an approval speech act:

*"Who's Agnes B.?"*

*"Clothes," Carrie said. "Classic but cool"* (J. Trollope "Marrying the mistress", p. 210).

I regard PRAISE as a positive evaluative expressive syncretic speech act, its evaluation theme being the moral and intellectual traits, skills and actions of the interlocutor or a person who is not present during a speech exchange but is praised by the speaker. If praise is aimed at the interlocutor's traits or actions, its recipient and evaluation object overlap. If the person whose traits or actions are praised is not present at the moment of speech, the speech act recipient and the evaluation object are different. It must be taken into account that in the latter case a third person's *appearance* can also serve an evaluation theme. It would be unwise to assume that positive evaluation of the third person's appearance can be defined as a compliment.

Here are examples of a praise speech act directed at the hearer and a praise speech act directed at a third person who is not present at the time of speech:

1) *When she went back to the kitchen, the fan was spinning busily.*

*"How clever of you, Charles," said Agatha. "What a relief! How did you get that big screw undone?"* (M.C. Beaton "Agatha Raisin and the wizard of Evesham", p. 29).

2) *"How was your work with Khaled?" Khader asked me when we walked back through the dock.*

*"Very good. I like him. I liked working with him. I'd still be with him if you hadn't put me to work with Madjid."* (G.D. Roberts "Shantaram", p. 486).

Another important fact about praise is that it is mainly directed from a senior (as to their age or social status) speaker to a junior one.

It is common knowledge that a praise addresser should have a moral right to praise another person's traits of character or actions. A praise speech act makes its addresser superior to the addressee: it is considered that the speaker should be some kind of authority in a certain sphere (Петелина 1988; Трофимова 2008).

I regard COMPLIMENT as a positive evaluative expressive syncretic speech act, characterized by the overlapping of the addressee and the evaluation object. The main fact about compliment is that it is always exaggerated, which is presupposed by the speaker's main intention: he/she wishes to please the recipient by means of positive evaluation of his/her appearance or accomplishments.

The subject of evaluation in a compliment speech act is the hearer's appearance, possessions, and accomplishments. It should be mentioned that the proportion of the compliment themes is strikingly unequal: the number of compliments on personal appearance, most particularly clothes and hairdos, is predominant, constituting over 80% of compliments in the research data.

It is noteworthy that compliments as positive evaluative speech acts tend to be exaggerated, whilst the exaggeration is anticipated and accepted on the part of the addressee as a natural component in the semantic structure of a compliment. Thus, almost any and every compliment can serve as an example of a different degree of intensity characteristic of an evaluative judgment and the corresponding evaluative utterance, e.g.,

*"I'll come with you. I'm ever so madly keen on antique dolls and I must say, that one you got is **the most fascinating and beautiful thing I've ever seen**" (M.C. Beaton "Agatha Raisin and the love from hell", p. 137).*

I regard FLATTERY as a pseudosincere positive evaluative manipulative expressive syncretic speech act, characterized by forethought, by a certain strategy, and also, by its addressee and evaluation object being the same person. Flattery evaluation themes are the addressee's appearance, their moral and intellectual traits, skills, accomplishments, and actions. The speaker flatters the addressee not being motivated by some feelings but wishing to gain some benefit. As far as the social status is concerned, the bulk of flattery speech acts is directed from a communicant of a lower status towards the one of a higher status, as it can be observed in the following example:

*Sheila knew that Jamie had a blinding hangover and that Jamie despised Patricia's writing, so she was surprised when Jamie beamed at Patricia and said, "**It's an honour to meet you**. Perhaps you'd like to come along with us until we fix up our business here and see how it all works, and then we can have a bite of lunch?"*

*Patricia melted. "That would be very exciting," she said (M.C. Beaton "Death of a scriptwriter", p. 31).*

Strictly speaking, the evaluation object in compliment and flattery speech acts can be actually not the hearer himself/herself (which is, of course, a most common case), but a relation of his/her. It can be explained by the fact that a positive evaluation directed at one's daughter, or mother, or wife, is usually as pleasant for the hearer as a positive evaluation of his/her own qualities or actions.

### *5.3 Approval, praise, compliment, and flattery speech acts perlocutionary effect*

As far as the perlocutionary effect of approval speech act is concerned, it is determined by the place of an approving utterance in a dialogue exchange. If an approval is expressed in the form of a responding move, the former completes a communicative exchange and does not need an explicit perlocutionary act. Nevertheless, a desired perlocutionary effect has been achieved: a ritual speech exchange has been performed in accordance with the etiquette regulations. If an approval is expressed as an initiative move, a typical response is agreement or disagreement. A disagreement may be caused by the impropriety or irrelevance of an approval, or by the speaker's wrong perception of a certain object or the recipient's antipathy towards the approval addresser.

The conducted research has shown that the perlocutionary effect of a praise speech act is determined by the praise focus: on the hearer or a third person. In the former case, the following perlocutionary acts are possible: gratefulness, embarrassment, praise escalation (bragging), pleasant surprise, denial (caused by the hearer's modesty), and unacceptance. In the latter case, a range of perlocutionary acts is rather narrow: acceptance or unacceptance.

It is a common truth that choosing to agree or disagree with an evaluative utterance can threaten the recipient's "face". It is noteworthy that the hearer's acceptance of praise attests that he/she is too self-assured or self-absorbed. Praise unacceptance does not mean a failure, but attests perlocutionary success, since unacceptance is caused, as a rule, by the hearer's modesty, as it is in the following example:

*"You've put a lot of thought into this," I commented, laughing, but **impressed** and genuinely glad that he wanted to give me the ontology of currency crime, and not just the ways I could go about committing it.*

*"Not really," he answered **self-deprecatingly**.*

*"No, I'm serious. When Khaderbhai sent me here ..."* (G.D. Roberts "Shantaram", p. 446).

In the example provided above, Khaled, an Indian, tells his new friend Lin, a former Australian who intends to live in India, about the black market in India. His speculations about the government's attitude to it and the people's greed as the main reason for the black market existing seem very profound to Lin, and he praises Khaled's reasoning. Khaled's response to being praised is unacceptance which the author qualifies as *"self-deprecating"*. The praise unacceptance is caused by the hearer's modesty.

Even if there is no verbal response to praise, the literary discourse reader is provided with the author's prompts revealing the perlocutionary effect of a praise speech act. Such literary discourse textual markers, as the praise addressee's inner speech, the author's description of their non-verbal behavior as well as their thoughts and feelings, explicate the perlocutionary effect of a praise speech act:

*"I'll miss my garden. Your mother. Her cooking. Your television shows."*

*I was flattered and embarrassed that he would put my work in the same league as his wife, his grandson and his garden* (T. Parsons "Man and boy", p. 276).

On the whole, a successful impact of a praise speech act upon the addressee is

determined by certain extralinguistic factors, such as the speech act participants' common background knowledge, implications and presuppositions, relevance of a positive evaluation in a given speech situation, the addresser's sincerity, and his/her non-indifference to the qualities and actions of the evaluation object.

Praise unacceptance by the hearer can be caused by the praise inappropriateness, the addresser's insufficient background knowledge, or the hearer's doubts concerning the addresser's evaluative competence. In the following speech exchange, the praise directed towards a third person is not accepted by the hearer (though she does not say it). The disagreement becomes evident to the reader since the recipient's inner speech is provided by the literary discourse author:

*"Oh, that was Rose. She said no one south could understand me and sent me to elocution lessons."*

*"Didn't think of taking any herself?"*

*"Rose had a beautiful voice," said Angus, looking at Agatha in surprise.*

*Love is blind, thought Agatha, and deaf as well (M.C. Beaton "Agatha Raisin and the terrible tourist", p. 115).*

Praise directed towards a third person can be rejected if the hearer is jealous or envious of the evaluation object, like Ali, who is jealous of Win:

*Ali looked back at the house. Win – real name: Windsor Horne Lockwood III – stood with arms folded, leaning against the doorframe. "Your friend Win," she said. "**He seems nice.**"*

*"He's not."*

*"I know. I just figured him being your best friend and all, I'd say that."*

*"Win is complicated."*

*"**He's good looking.**"*

*"He knows" (H. Coben "Promise me", p. 18).*

Another speech situation exemplifies praise for a third person (a wife's friend) rejected by the speaker. The unacceptance is caused by the fact that the wife is not an authority for the husband, an arrogant and conceited man:

*Kate kissed her friend goodbye at the end of the evening, waving her off with a false cheeriness. She turned to Marcus with anger in her eyes, opening her mouth to speak. But there was something in his gaze, a coldness, a rigid set of the shoulders, that scared her, gave her pause.*

*"No idea what you see in that one," he said flatly. "We won't be doing that again."*

*"**She is a good friend,**" Kate muttered, deflated.*

*"See her on her own time, but I think you might have outgrown her" (L. Bagshawe "Destiny", p. 105).*

As far as the perlocutionary effect of a compliment speech act is concerned, most typically it is framed as follows: full acceptance; mirror response, i.e. saying a compliment in response; ironical acceptance; changing the topic of the conversation or unacceptance. The main perlocutionary effect expected by the compliment addresser is the compliment acceptance (expressed verbally or non-verbally). The formal signal registering compliment acceptance is a smile, a nod or the addresser's embarrassment. Compliment acceptance is usually accompanied by gratitude or irony.

Compliment rejection is motivated by the recipient's modesty: a positive evaluation of self violates the Modesty Maxim and is socially unacceptable, as it is in the following speech exchange:

*Daniel shook Harry's hand and said, "**Ah. Diocesan Board of Finance couldn't do without you, I hear, Colonel Richardson,**" and Harry said, as she knew he would, "It's nothing. Nothing at all. Like to do my bit" (J. Trollope "The rector's wife", p. 120).*

In the provided example, Daniel gives a compliment to Colonel Richardson at a village party. Daniel is of a higher social status than the colonel, he lives and works in London and is quite well-known in certain circles. Moreover, he provides the financial board's

flattering opinion of the colonel's work which is sure to please the captain. Therefore, his negative response will deceive neither the reader, nor another communicant, Anna (*as she knew he would*): it is motivated by his modesty.

In literary discourse, the compliment recipient may verbally ignore the compliment, but the context analysis and the author's commentary help the reader recognize the recipient's positive attitude to the compliment. The literary discourse reader is sure of its success if a compliment is accompanied by the author's description of such non-verbal signals of pleasure on the recipient's face as a smile or a blush, as it is in the following literary discourse extracts:

1) *They watched the conductor turn the small silver handle on the ticket machine, and both giggled and blushed when he said, "**The sight of two pretty girls has warmed the cockles of me heart**"* (J. Jonker "I'll be your sweetheart", p. 372);

2) *He pauses, staring at me for a little while. "**You look different.**"*

*"Do I?" I blush furiously.*

***"Exceptionally well."***

*I grin despite myself. I can feel the grin getting wider and wider, slinging from earlobe to earlobe* (P. Williams "How to be married", p. 199).

If, however, compliment unacceptance is caused by its inappropriateness, insincerity or the recipient's dislike for the addresser, it should be regarded as the perlocutionary effect undesirable for the speaker, as it is in the following episode:

*"But go on, go on. You have not begun to satisfy me yet. You did not stop with finding a motive for the crime I am sure."*

***"Madam, you are a female Sherlock; you will have the whole of the bond or none."***

*"We are not here to draw comparisons," I retorted. "Keep to the subject, Mr. Gryce; keep to the subject"* (A.K. Green "That affair next door", p. 296).

A mirror compliment, that is redirection of a compliment to its author in accordance with the Politeness Principle, allows the recipient to preserve the communicative balance and not to impinge on any of the participants' interests:

*"You look wonderful," she purred.*

*He was in his standard black Armani suit.*

*"Thank you. Look who's talking, though. You're breathtaking"* (L. Bagshawe "Destiny", p. 323).

As for flattery, the realization of the speaker's illocutionary aims is a success if the flattery is well-thought and nicely shaped, with its object being self-absorbed and considering himself/herself a genius. The perlocutionary effect of flattery is achieved if the speaker is able to disguise an evaluation speech act type and pretend it is a-praise or a compliment. If the speaker manages that, the perlocutionary effect of flattery will manifest itself in the form of agreement (verbal or non-verbal), gratitude, pleasant surprise, mirror response or flattery rejection caused by false modesty. If the speaker's intentions are decoded as they should, the recipient's response will be negative: the flattery will be rejected.

Here is an example of flattery rejection. Viv has been waiting for her lover, Reggie, in the sun for half an hour. Seeking forgiveness, he flatters her appearance. The flattery is expressed in an indirect way: Reggie pretends she is a film-star and he is a fan asking for an autograph. The reader knows that their relationship is coming to an end: Reggie does not intend to leave his wife, he has recently made Viv go through an abortion. After the abortion, Viv is not at her best. Thus, the flattery is decoded (*Just get going, will you?*):

*"You look like a film-star," said Reggie, as Viv got into his car. He made a show of looking her over. "Can I have your autograph?"*

*"Just get going, will you?" she said. She'd been standing in the sun, waiting for him, for half an hour* (S. Waters "The night watch", p. 61).

Therefore, the felicity conditions of evaluative speech acts are determined by such extralinguistic factors, as the speech act participants' common background knowledge, implications and presuppositions, relevance of a positive evaluation in a given speech situation, the addresser's sincerity, and his/her non-indifference to the evaluation object's qualities and actions.

Positive evaluation unacceptance by the hearer is caused by its inappropriateness, the speaker's insufficient background knowledge, or the hearer's doubts concerning the speaker's evaluative competence. A negative reaction to a positive evaluative speech act may be caused by the addressee's suspicions about the speaker's insincerity, the addressee's dislike for the speaker, inappropriateness of an evaluative utterance in a certain setting, a mistake in the choice of the evaluation theme, mockery, familiarity, envy, or jealousy of the evaluation object. All these facts become obvious to the reader not only due to the recipient's verbally explicit response, but also due to their thoughts, feelings, and non-verbal behavior, depicted by a literary discourse author.

As a summary of the taxonomy of positive evaluative speech acts, Table 1 below illustrates the objects and themes of evaluative speech acts.

Table 1. Taxonomy of positive evaluative speech acts

	<b>Positive evaluative speech acts</b>			
	<b>approval</b>	<b>praise</b>	<b>compliment</b>	<b>flattery</b>
Evaluation object	inanimate things, ideas, phenomena that do not refer to the addressee's sphere of interests	the hearer or a 3 <sup>rd</sup> person, not present during the speech exchange	the hearer or (less often) a person related to him/her (by blood or by marriage) but not present during the speech exchange	the hearer or (less often) a person related to him/her (by blood or by marriage) but not present during the speech exchange
Evaluation theme	those features of the evaluated inanimate objects, which attract the	moral and intellectual traits, skills, and actions of the interlocutor or a 3 <sup>rd</sup> person;	the hearer's appearance, possessions, and accomplishments	the hearer's appearance, moral and intellectual traits, possessions, and accomplishments

	addresser's attention	appearance of a 3 <sup>rd</sup> person		
--	-----------------------	--	--	--

## 6. Discussion and conclusion

Thus, a new research methodology, the cognitive communicative axiology of reproduced discourse, has been offered. The methodology enables a study of the cognitive processes that occur in communicants' minds during production or perception of evaluative speech in reproduced discourse. While in real communication the communicants' thoughts and intentions remain unknown to the researcher, the author's comment and the communicant's inner speech in literary discourse as well as the speakers' non-verbal behaviour and the offscreen voice in film discourse tell the reader/viewer about the communicant's genuine purposes and feelings.

Furthermore, it has been helpful to present and analyse the opposition "evaluation – non-evaluation". If an object gets into a subject's zone of concern, the process of evaluating is sure to take place, and thus positive, negative, or mixed evaluation is produced. The observation of evaluative utterance production in reproduced discourse suggests that there is no such thing as neutral evaluation: if the speakers say they are indifferent to a certain object, it implies rather a negative attitude.

It has also been proved that an evaluative utterance does not necessarily equal the preceding evaluative cognitive judgment: they might differ in terms of their intensity, or even positive or negative character. Furthermore, an evaluative judgment formed in a person's mind might remain unvoiced, or, on the other hand, a certain evaluative utterance may be caused not by an evaluative judgment but rather be forced by a realized necessity of producing an evaluative utterance in a certain communicative situation.

Moreover, a taxonomy of positive evaluative approval, praise, compliment, and flattery speech acts functioning in English literary discourse and film discourse has been put

forward. The illocutionary aims, evaluation objects, and themes, as well as the perlocutionary effect of approval, praise, compliment, and flattery speech acts have been outlined. Positive evaluative speech acts have been defined as syncretic illocutionary speech acts, since they realize simultaneously two or more illocutions. Their major illocutionary aims are to express positive evaluation of certain people, things, state of affairs, ideas, as well as to make a positive emotional impact upon the addressee. The illocutionary aims characteristic of each of the studied speech act types have been specified as well.

In terms of evaluation objects, approval stays apart from the rest of the researched speech acts, since its evaluation objects are inanimate things or ideas that do not belong to the addressee's sphere of interests. Compliment and flattery have turned out to be mainly directed at the interlocutor. Praise is aimed at the interlocutor or a third person.

Praise evaluation themes are moral and intellectual traits, skills, and actions of the interlocutor or a third person as well as appearance of a third person. The theme of evaluation in a compliment speech act is the hearer's appearance, possessions, and accomplishments. Flattery evaluation themes are similar to those of praise and compliment.

Another important finding is the identification of the perlocutionary effect of positive evaluative speech acts. As for approval, it often completes a communicative exchange and does not need an explicit perlocutionary act. Yet, if an approval is expressed as an initiative move, a typical response is agreement or disagreement. The perlocutionary effect of a praise speech act is determined by praise direction: towards the hearer or a third person. In the former case, the following perlocutionary acts are possible: gratefulness, embarrassment, praise escalation, pleasant surprise, denial (caused by the hearer's modesty), and unacceptance. In the latter case, it is acceptance or unacceptance. The perlocutionary effect of a compliment speech act may be full acceptance, mirror response, ironical acceptance, changing the topic of the conversation,

or unacceptance. As for flattery speech act, the speaker's illocutionary aims are achieved if the flattery is well-thought and nicely shaped, and its object is conceited: then flattery is accepted. If flattery is decoded, it is unaccepted.

As a final point, the felicity conditions of evaluative speech acts have been determined and include the communicants' common background knowledge, implications and presuppositions; the relevance of a positive evaluation in a given speech situation; the addresser's sincerity and empathy for the evaluation object.

## References

Altani, I. (1991). Compliments and compliment responses in Greek and English. In *Proceedings of the 5th symposium on the description and/or comparison of English and Greek*, Department of English studies. Athens: University of Thessaloniki, p. 78-112.

Ananko, T. (2017). The category of evaluation in political discourse. In *Advanced education*, 8, p. 128-137.

Arutyunova, N.D. (1988). *Types of language meanings: Evaluation. Event. Fact.* Moscow: Nauka. / Arutyunova N.D. *Типы языковых значений: Оценка. Событие. Факт.* Москва: Наука. / АРУТЮНОВА Н.Д. *Типы языковых значений: Оценка. Событие. Факт.* Москва: Наука.

Austin, J.L. (1962). *How to do things with words.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bagshawe, L. (2011). *Destiny.* London: Headline Review.

Beaton, M.C. (2009a). *Agatha Raisin and the love from hell.* London: C & R Crime.

Beaton, M.C. (2009b). *Agatha Raisin and the terrible tourist.* London: C & R Crime.

Beaton, M.C. (2009c). *Agatha Raisin and the wizard of Evesham.* London: C & R Crime.

Beaton, M.C. (2009d). *Death of a scriptwriter.* London: C & R Crime.

Beaton, M.C. (2010). *Death of a witch.* London: C & R Crime.

Beaton, M.C. (2011). *Death of a prankster.* London: C & R Crime.

Bessonova, I.V. (2003). *Speech acts of praise and disapproval of the interlocutor in dialogue discourse of modern German.* Thesis for the candidate degree in philology.

Speciality 10.02.04 – Germanic languages. Tambov: Tambov State University. / Bessonova I.V. *Rechevyye akty pokhvaly i poritsaniya sobesednika v dialogicheskom diskurse sovremennogo nemetskogo yazyka*. Dissertatsiya na soiskaniye uchyonoj stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. Spetsial'nost' 10.02.04 – germanskiye yazyki. Tambov: Tambovskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. / Бессонова И.В. *Речевые акты похвалы и порицания собеседника в диалогическом дискурсе современного немецкого языка*. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. Специальность 10.02.04 – германские языки. Тамбов: Тамбовский государственный университет.

Byessonova, O.L. (2002). *The English language evaluative thesaurus: Cognitive gender aspects*. Donetsk: Donetsk National University. / Biessonova O.L. *Otsinnyj tezaurus anhlijskoyi movy: Kohnityvno-henderni aspekty*. Donetsk: Donetskiy natsionalnyj universytet. / Бессонова О.Л. *Оцінний тезаурус англійської мови: Когнітивно-гендерні аспекти*. Донецьк: Донецький національний університет.

Bigunova, N.O. (2017). *Positive evaluation: From cognitive judgment to communicative utterance*. Odesa: OMD. / Bihunova N.O. *Pozytyvna otsinka: Vid kohnityvnoho sudzhennia do komunikatyvnoho vyslovliuvannia*. Odesa: OMD. / Бігунова Н.О. *Позитивна оцінка: Від когнітивного судження до комунікативного висловлювання*. Одеса: ОМД.

Bondarko, A.V. (1996). *The semantics of grammar and Russian aspectology problems*. Saint Petersburg: Saint Petersburg University. / Bondarko A.V. *Problemy grammaticheskoy semantiki i russkoj aspektologii*. Sankt-Peterburg: Sankt-Peterburgskij universitet. / Бондарко А.В. *Проблемы грамматической семантики и русской аспектологии*. Санкт-Петербург: Санкт-Петербургский университет.

Bulygina, T.V. & Shmelev, A.D. (1997). *Language conceptualization of the world (on the samples of Russian grammar)*. Moscow: YaRK. / Bulygina T.V., Shmelev A.D. *Yazykovaya kontseptualizatsyya mira (na materiale russkoj grammatiki)*. Moskva: YaRK. / Булыгина Т.В., Шмелев А.Д. *Языковая концептуализация мира (на материале русской грамматики)*. Москва: ЯРК.

Burov, A.A. (2001). Designation-syntax semiosis in modern Russian-English discourse: Dictionary new reality. In Newsletter of *Pyatigorsk state university*, 4, p. 5-9. / Burov A.A. Nominatsionno-sintaksicheskij semiozis v sovremennom russko-yazychnom diskurse: Novaya real'nost slovarya. In *Vestnik Pyatigorskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*, 4. Pyatigorsk: Izdatel'stvo Pyatigorskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, s. 5-9. / Буров А.А. Номинационно-синтаксический семиозис в современном русско-язычном дискурсе: Новая реальность словаря. In *Вестник Пятигорского государственного университета*, 4. Пятигорск: Издательство Пятигорского государственного университета, p. 5-9.

Coben, H. (2009). *Deal breaker*. London: Orion.

Coben, H. (2007). *Promise me*. London: Orion.

Gorshkova, V.E. (2006). *Translation in film*. Irkutsk: Irkutsk State Linguistic University. / Gorshkova V.E. *Perevod v kino*. Irkutsk: Irkutskij gosudarstvennyj lingvisticheskij universitet. / Горшкова В.Е. Перевод в кино. Иркутск: Иркутский государственный лингвистический университет.

Demyankov, V.Z. (2005). Text and discourse as terms and as words of everyday language. In *Language. Personality. Text*, Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskikh kul'tur, p. 34-55. / Demyankov V.Z. *Tekst i diskurs kak terminy i kak slova obydenного yazyka*. In *Yazyk. Lichnost'. Tekst*, Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskikh kul'tur, s. 34-55. / Демьянков В.З. Текст и дискурс как термины и как слова обыденного языка. In *Язык. Личность. Текст*, Москва: Языки славянских культур, p. 34-55.

Dorda, S.V. (2007). Addressee factor in the utterances of flattery. In *New philology: Collection of scientific works*, 26. Zaporizhzhia: Zaporizhzhia National University, p. 48-52. / Dorda S.V. Faktor adresata v vyskazyvaniyakh lesti. In *Nova filologiya: Zbirnyk naukovykh prats'*, 26. Zaporizhzhia: Zaporizkyj natsionalnyj universytet, s. 48-52. / Дорда С.В. Фактор адресата в высказываниях лести. In *Нова філологія: Збірник наукових праць*. Запоріжжя: Запорізький національний університет, 26, с. 48-52.

*Friends*. (1998). Sitcom. Season 5. Series 3.

Green, A. K. (2007). *That affair next door*. New York: A. L. Burt Company Publishers.

- Herbert, R.K. (1989). The ethnography of English compliments and compliment responses: A contrastive sketch. In *Contrastive pragmatics*. Oleksy, W. (ed.). Amsterdam: John Benjamins publishing company, p. 3-35.
- Highmore, J. (2009). *The birthday*. London: Headline Review.
- Holmes, J. (1988). Paying compliments: A sex-preferential strategy. In *Journal of pragmatics*, 12. London: Elsevier, p. 445-465.
- Hunston, S. & Thompson, G. (2001). *Evaluation in text. Authorial stance and the construction of discourse*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Ivin, A.A. (1970). *The logics of evaluation basis*. Moscow: Nauka. / Ivin A.A. *Osnovaniye logiki otsenok*. Moskva: Nauka. / ИВИН А.А. *Основание логики оценок*. Москва: Наука.
- Jones, R.C. (2009). *Ten seconds from the sun*. London: Abacus.
- Jonker, J. (2005). *I'll be your sweetheart*. London: Headline.
- Kabankova, T.V. (2011). *Functioning of syncretic speech acts of approval / disapproval in modern German dialogue discourse*. Thesis for the candidate degree in philology. Speciality 10.02.04 – Germanic languages. Tambov: Tambov State University. / Kabankova T.V. *Funktsionirovaniye sinkretichnykh rechevykh aktov odobreniya / neodobreniya v sovremennom nemetskom dialogicheskom diskurse*. Dissertatsiya na soiskaniye uchenoj stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. Spetsial'nost' 10.02.04 – germanskiye yazyki. Tambov: Tambovskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. / Кабанкова Т.В. *Функционирование синкретичных речевых актов одобрения / неодобрения в современном немецком диалогическом дискурсе*. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. Специальность 10.02.04 – германские языки. Тамбов: Тамбовский государственный университет.
- Klochko, L.I. (2003). *The utterances of praise in communicative-activity paradigm of communication (on the English language samples)*. Thesis for the candidate degree in philology. Speciality 10.02.04 – Germanic languages. Sumy: Sumy State University. / Klochko L.I. *Vyskazyvaniya pokhvaly v kommunikativno-deyatel'nostnoj paradigme obscheniya (na materiale anglijskogo yazyka)*. Dissertatsiya na soiskaniye uchenoj

stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. Spetsial'nost' 10.02.04 – germanskiye yazyki. Sumy: Sumskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. / Ключко Л.И. *Высказывания похвалы в коммуникативно-деятельностной парадигме общения (на материале английского языка)*. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. Специальность 10.02.04 – германские языки. Сумы: Сумский государственный университет.

Kolegaeva, I. & Strochenko, L. (2018). Academic and literary communication: Addressability, statuses, and functioning. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow*. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava, III (2), December 2018. Warsaw: De Gruyter Poland, p. 72-104.

Kolodina, E.A. (2013). *Semiotics systems interaction in film dialogue sense formation*. Thesis for the candidate degree in philology. Speciality 10.02.04 – language theory. Irkutsk: Irkutsk state linguistic university. / Kolodina E.A. *Vzaimodejstviye semioticheskikh sistem pri formirovanii smysla kinodialoga*. Dissertatsiya na soiskaniye uchenoj stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. Spetsial'nost' 10.02.19 – teoriya yazyka. Irkutsk: Irkutskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. / Колодина Е.А. *Взаимодействие семиотических систем при формировании смысла кинодиалога*. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. Специальность 10.02.19 – теория языка. Иркутск: Иркутский государственный университет.

Konova, I.A. (1992). Speech acts of praise and disapproval. In *Germanistics: A collection of scientific works*. Saint Petersburg: Obrazovaniye, p. 52-58. / Konova I.A. *Rechevyue akty pokhvaly i poritsaniya*. In *Germanistika: Sbornik nauchnykh trudov*. Sankt-Peterburg: Obrazovaniye, s. 52-58. / Конова И.А. *Речевые акты похвалы и порицания*. In *Германистика: Сборник научных трудов*. Санкт-Петербург: Образование, с. 52-58.

Kozloff, S. (2000). *Overhearing film dialogue*. Berkeley & Los Angeles: University of California press.

- Kubryakova, E.S. (1986). *Nominative aspect of speech activity*. Moscow: Nauka. / Kubryakova E.S. *Nominativnyj aspekt rechevoj deyatel'nosti*. Moskva: Nauka. / Кубрякова Е.С. *Номинативный аспект речевой деятельности*. Москва: Наука.
- Kubrjakova, E.S. (2005). On the term "discourse" and knowledge structure that it calls forth. In *Language. Personality. Text*, Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskikh kul'tur, p. 23-33. / Kubryakova E.S. О термине "diskurs" i stoyaschej za nim strukture znaniya. In *Yazyk. Lichnost'. Tekst*, Moskva: Yazyki slavyanskikh kul'tur, s. 23-33. / Кубрякова Е.С. О термине "дискурс" и стоящей за ним структуре знания. In *Язык. Личность. Текст*, Москва: Языки славянских культур, с. 23-33.
- Kukhareno, V.A. (2018). *Text and its structure: Educational book*. Moscow: Flinta. / Kuharenko V.A. *Tekst i yego struktura: Uchebnoye posobiye*. Moskva: Flinta. / Кухаренко В.А. *Текст и его структура: Учебное пособие*. Москва: Флинта.
- Lakoff, R.T. & Tannen, D. (1984). Conversational strategy and metastrategy in a pragmatic theory: The example of scenes from a marriage. In *Semiotica*, 49. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company, p. 323-346.
- Love actually*. (2003). Universal pictures: Directed by Richard Curtis.
- Manes, J. (1983). Compliments: A mirror of cultural values. In *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition*, Wolfson, N. & Judd, E. (eds.). Rowley – London: Newbury House Publishers, p. 96-102.
- Martin, J.R. & White, P.R. (2005). *The language of evaluation: Appraisal in English*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Myroniuk, T. (2017). Evaluative responses in Modern English fiction. In *Advanced education*, 8, p. 103-108.
- Page, N. (1973). *Speech in the English novel*. London: Longman.
- Parsons, A.D. (2010). *The call on high country*. London: Penguin Global.
- Parsons, T. (1999). *Man and boy*. London: Harper Collins publishers.
- Petelina, E.S. (1988). *The means of expressing and the contexts of functioning of praise and flattery utterances in the English language*. Synopsis for thesis for the candidate degree in philology. Speciality 10.02.04 – Germanic languages. Pyatigorsk: Pyatigorsk State University. / Petelina E.S. *Sredstva vyrazheniya i konteksty funktsionirovaniya*

*vyskazyvanij pokhvaly i lesti v anglijskom yazyke*. Avtoreferat dissertatsii na soiskaniye uchyonoj stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. Spetsial'nost' 10.02.04 – germanskiye yazyki. Pyatigorsk: Pyatigorskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. / Петелина Е.С. *Средства выражения и контексты функционирования высказываний похвалы и лести в английском языке*. Автореферат диссертации на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. Специальность 10.02.04 – германские языки. Пятигорск: Пятигорский государственный университет.

Prihodko, A.I. (2016). Cognitive-communicative organization of the evaluative frame. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*, Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, I (1), June 2016, p. 275-308.

Рым, В. (2009). *A glass of blessings*. London: Virago.

Roberts, G.D. (2008). *Shantaram*. London: Abacus.

Samokhina, V. & Pasynok, V. (2017). Anthroponymic world in the text of the Anglophone joke. In *Lege artis. Language yesterday, today, tomorrow. The journal of University of SS Cyril and Methodius in Trnava*. Warsaw: De Gruyter Open, II (2), December 2016, p. 284-355.

Searle, J.R. (1969). *Speech acts: An essay in the philosophy of language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Selivanova, O.O. (2010). *Linguistic encyclopedia*. Poltava: Dovkillia-K. / Selivanova O.O. *Linhvistychna entsyklopediya*. Poltava: Dovkillia-K / Селіванова О.О. *Лінгвістична енциклопедія*. Полтава: Довкілля-К.

Serebryakova, R.V. (2002). *National peculiarity of praise and compliment speech acts in Russian and English communicative cultures*. Thesis for the candidate degree in philology. Speciality 10.02.04 – language theory. Voronezh: Voronezh State University. / Serebryakova R.V. *Natsional'naya spetsifika rechevykh aktov komplimenta i pokhvaly v russkoj i anglijskoj kommunikativnykh kul'turakh*. Dissertatsiya na soiskaniye uchyonoj stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. Spetsial'nost' 10.02.19 – teoriya yazyka. Voronezh: Voronezhskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. / Серебрякова Р.В. *Национальная специфика речевых актов*

*комплимента и похвалы в русской и английской коммуникативных культурах.*

Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук.

Специальность 10.02.19 – теория языка. Воронеж: Воронежский государственный университет.

Sheldon, S. (2012). *Nothing lasts forever*. London: HarperCollins.

Strawson, P.P. (1967). *Introduction to logical theory*. London: Methuen.

Trollope, J.A. (2014). *A village affair*. London: Berkley Trade.

Trollope, J. (2001). *Marrying the mistress*. London: Black swan.

Trollope, J. (1992). *The rector's wife*. London: Black swan.

Trofimova, N.A. (2008). *Expressive speech acts: Semantic, pragmatic, grammar analysis*. Saint Petersburg: VVM. / Trofimova N.A. *Ekspressivnyye rechevyue акты: Semanticheskij, pragmaticheskij, grammaticheskij analiz*. Sankt-Peterburg: VVM. /

Трофимова Н.А. *Экспрессивные речевые акты: Семантический, прагматический, грамматический анализ*. Санкт-Петербург: VVM. /

Трофимова Н.А. *Экспрессивные речевые акты: Семантический, прагматический, грамматический анализ*. Санкт-Петербург: ВВМ.

Volf, E.M. (2006). *Functional semantics of evaluation*. 3<sup>rd</sup> ed., ster. Moscow: KomKniga. /

Volf E.M. *Funktsional'naya semantika otsenki*. 3 izd., ster. Moskva: KomKniga. /

Вольф Е.М. *Функциональная семантика оценки*. 3-е изд., стер. Москва: КомКнига.

Москва: КомКнига.

Vorkachyov, S.G. (2006). *Evaluation and value in language: Selected works on Spanish studies*. Volgograd: Paradigma. /

Vorkachyov S.G. *Otsenka i tsennost' v yazyke: Izbrannyye raboty po ispanistike*. Volgograd: Paradigma. /

Воркачев С.Г. *Оценка и ценность в языке: Избранные работы по испанистике*. Волгоград: Парадигма.

Воркачев С.Г. *Оценка и ценность в языке: Избранные работы по испанистике*. Волгоград: Парадигма.

Парадигма.

Waters, S. (2011). *The night watch*. London: Virago.

Wierzbicka, A. (1991). *Cross-cultural pragmatics: The semantics of human interaction*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.

Williams, P. (2010). *How to be married*. London: Headline Review.

Wolfson, N. (1983). An empirically based analysis of complimenting in American English. In *Sociolinguistics and language acquisition*. Wolfson, N. & Judd E. (eds.). London: Newbury House Publishers, p. 82-95.

London: Newbury House Publishers, p. 82-95.

Yaroshevich, E.V. (2003). *The constructions of approval and encouragement in stylistic-syntactic aspect (on the modern English language samples)*. Thesis for the candidate degree in philology. Speciality 10.02.04 – Germanic languages. Moscow: Moscow State Pedagogical University. / Yaroshevich E.V. *Konstruktsii odobreniya i pooschreniya v stilistiko-sintaksicheskom aspekte (na materiale sovremennogo anglijskogo yazyka)*. Dissertatsiya na soiskaniye uchyonoj stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. Spetsial'nost' 10.02.04 – germanskiye yazyki. Moskva: Moskovskij gosudarstvennyj pedagogicheskij universitet. / Ярошевич Е.В. *Конструкции одобрения и поощрения в стилистико-синтаксическом аспекте (на материале современного английского языка)*. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. Специальность 10.02.04 – германские языки. Москва: Московский государственный педагогический университет.

Zagraevskaya, T.B. (2006). *The category "evaluation", its status and verbalization in the modern English language*. Thesis for the candidate degree in philology. Speciality 10.02.04 – Germanic languages. Pyatigorsk: Pyatigorsk State University. / Zagraevskaya T.B. *Kategoriya "otsenka", yeyo status i verbalizatsiya v sovremennom anglijskom yazyke*. Dissertatsiya na soiskaniye uchyonoj stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. Spetsial'nost' 10.02.04 – germanskiye yazyki. Pyatigorsk: Pyatigorskij gosudarstvennyj lingvisticheskij universitet. / Заграевская Т.Б. *Категория "оценка", ее статус и вербализация в современном английском языке*. Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. Специальность 10.02.04 – германские языки. Пятигорск: Пятигорский государственный лингвистический университет.

Zaretskaya, A.N. (2010). *The peculiarities of subtext realization in film discourse*. Thesis for the candidate degree in philology. Speciality 10.02.19 – language theory. Chelyabinsk: Chelyabinsk State University. / Zaretskaya A.N. *Osobennosti realizatsii podteksta v kinodiskurse*. Dissertatsiya na soiskaniye uchenoj stepeni kandidata filologicheskikh nauk. Spetsial'nost' 10.02.19 – teoriya yazyka. Chelyabinsk: Chelyabinskij gosudarstvennyj universitet. / Зарецкая А.Н. *Особенности*

*реализации подтекста в кинодискурсе.* Диссертация на соискание ученой степени кандидата филологических наук. Специальность 10.02.19 – теория языка. Челябинск: Челябинский государственный университет.

### List of abbreviations

EJ – evaluative judgment

EU – evaluative utterance

<p><b>Contact data</b> Natalia Bigunova DSc. (Philology), Associate professor at the Chair of Theoretical and Applied Phonetics of the English language, Odesa I.I. Mechnikov National University, Dvoryanska str., 2, Odesa, Ukraine, 65082 e-mail: <a href="mailto:natalbig@ukr.net">natalbig@ukr.net</a></p>		<p><b>Fields of interest</b></p> <p>Cognitive semantics, pragmatics, axiology, discourse studies, phonostylistics.</p>
---	---	--

### Résumé

The article offers the research methodology of a new branch of linguistics – cognitive communicative axiology of reproduced discourse. The article focuses on the cognitive pragmatic properties and regularities of communicatively manifested positive evaluation. The opposition "evaluation – non-evaluation" has been offered. If an object gets into a subject's zone of concern, the process of evaluating is sure to take place and thus positive, negative, or mixed evaluation is produced. The author denies the existence of neutral evaluation: a voiced neutral or indifferent attitude to a certain object suggests rather a negative attitude. The article reports on pragmatic peculiarities of evaluative cognitive judgment formation and its transformation into an evaluative communicative utterance. It has been proved that an evaluative speech act will not always equal an evaluative cognitive judgment as to its intensity, or its positive or negative character. Genuine evaluative judgments become explicit to the reader of

literary discourse through the author's description of the characters' thoughts and non-verbal behaviour. The article also provides a taxonomy of positive evaluative approval, praise, compliment, and flattery speech acts functioning in English literary discourse and film discourse. The illocutionary aims, evaluation objects and themes, as well as the perlocutionary effect of approval, praise, compliment, and flattery speech acts have been outlined. Positive evaluative speech acts have been defined as syncretic illocutionary speech acts, since they realize simultaneously two or more illocutions. Their major illocutionary aim is to express positive evaluation of certain people, things, state of affairs, ideas, as well as to make a positive emotional impact upon the addressee. In terms of evaluation objects, approval has turned out to stay apart, since its evaluation objects are inanimate things and ideas that do not belong to the addressee's sphere of interests. Compliment and flattery have turned out to be mainly directed at the interlocutor. Praise is aimed at the interlocutor or a third person.

**Key words:** evaluation, evaluative judgment vs evaluative utterance, literary discourse, film discourse, speech act, approval, praise, compliment, flattery.

Article was received by the editorial board 15.12.18;

Reviewed 21.02.19. and 10.03.19.

Similarity Index 4%