

Evaluative Thesaurus as Instrument in Coding Values of the English Linguocultural Community

Olga Byessonova

Introductory notes. Basic terminology

Evaluative thesaurus is an important part of any language vocabulary, which contains systemic information about concrete and abstract notions that language speakers consider valuable. Evaluative thesaurus incorporates semantic information, connected with the category of evaluation. Evaluative thesaurus constitutes part of the language model of the world and coincides with the corresponding sector of the conceptual model of the world, called the values model of the world (Byessonova, 2012, p. 5-6). The values model of the world is arranged through the system of cultural universals, i.e., a set of interconnected universal notions, which can be encoded by language means. As a result, a detailed list of concepts is suggested in the present paper, which makes a basis for the description of the values system of the English linguocultural community and the way it is expressed in the language vocabulary.

The approach pursued in the present research enables us to focus on how human mentality can be reflected in the language. It also addresses the dependence of the English-speaking community values system perception upon the communicants' gender. The language model of the world, with a word being its basic unit, is an essential constituent of the national linguoculture. The language model is identified with the language system, its units, and their interrelations.

The language units encode the values system of a cultural community in general and individual language speakers in particular.

Value is a positive or negative significance of the objects of the surrounding world for the speaking community. This significance is determined not by the objects' properties as such, but by their role in the life of an individual language speaker and in the life of the speaking community in general. As a category of logic, value correlates to the linguistic category of evaluation. *Evaluation* is defined as a speaker's objective or subjective attitude to a certain object, which is explicitly or implicitly expressed by language means (Kunin/Кунин, 1980, 1996). As a semantic category, evaluation is based on the logical notion of "value." This correlation is interpreted by the following proposition "A (subject of evaluation) considers that B (object of evaluation) is good/bad" (Volf/Вольф, 2002).

Evaluative meaning is understood as information about the speaker's attitude to a certain property of an object in terms of the opposition "good/bad". Evaluation can be part of both a word denotative and connotative meaning. Connotation is a macrocomponent of a word meaning, which incorporates the emotional and evaluative attitude of a speaker to the subject of nomination. I. Arnold singles out four types of connotation: stylistic, evaluative, emotional, and expressive (Arnold/Арнольд, 1986). Connotation can be treated as a specific superstructure over the logical content, which combines evaluative, expressive, emotive, and stylistic functions.

Evaluation has a complex structure. It can be represented in the form of a frame with the following slots: 1) subject of evaluation, 2) object of evaluation, 3) character of evaluation (positive/negative), 4) basis of evaluation (explicit or implicit), 5) aspect of evaluation (place, type of evaluation, evaluative stereotypes), 6) content of evaluative procedure (action of evaluation), 7) result of evaluation.

Dictionary evaluation is built up by the slots *subject of evaluation*, *object of evaluation*, *character of evaluation*, *basis of evaluation*. For example, the dictionary meaning of the adjective *humane* is definitely positive: *showing human kindness and the qualities of a civilized person*. In this case, the evaluative connotation is part of the denotational component of word meaning and is elicited through the evaluative words *kindness*, *civilized*.

The rest of the slots, i.e., *aspect of evaluation* (*place*, *type of evaluation*, *evaluative stereotypes*), *content of evaluative procedure* (*action of evaluation*), *result of evaluation* are relevant in the evaluative utterance. For instance, in the evaluative utterance, “I hate her!” she cried desperately. Red-headed thing! Calling me ‘darling’ and ‘honey,’ and sending me handkerchiefs for C-Christmas – and then sneaking off behind closed doors and k-kissing my h-husband” (K. Brush, p. 88-89) the adjectives *darling* and *honey*, which have a positive dictionary meaning, are negative in the context mentioned above. It is the case when the character of evaluation changes in the context, here from positive to negative. In the example that follows, the neutral in terms of evaluation word *property* acquires a negative shade of meaning: ‘*Mr Crich can’t see you. He can’t see you at this hour. Do you think he is your property, that you can come whenever you like?*’ (D. H. Lawrence, *Women in Love*, p. 288-289).

The fundamental principle of evaluation is the opposition “good” / “bad.” This opposition is the basis for all types of evaluation and a prototypical axiological scale. Other indications of the “good” / “bad” opposition can be “true” / “false,” “important” / “unimportant”, “beautiful” / “ugly”. Some linguists also include here the oppositions “up” / “down,” “forward” / “backward,” “active” / “passive,” “here” / “there,” interpreting them as options of the opposition “good” / “bad” (Lakoff, Johnson 1980). As any opposition transforms into the “good” / “bad” opposition, the concepts *GOOD* and *BAD* can be considered metaphoric ones.

The axiological scale can be modeled in different ways (Byessonova, 2012). According to one of the patterns, it has three zones on it: positive, negative, and zero. The speaker's attitude and his or her evaluative qualification vary from mere ascertaining the existence of properties in the object to the positive or negative attitude to them. Thus, "zero" or "neutral" evaluation expresses the speaker's indifferent attitude to the properties of the referent. "Zero evaluation" is a semantic component of words, which express the norm of a certain quality or property and make the background against which positive or negative evaluative deviations are perceived.

On another type of the axiological scale, the evaluation norm coincides with its positive edge (Arutyunova/Арутюнова, 1999; Volf/Вольф, 2002; Bolinger, 1972). In this way, the norm acquires an axiological function, being perceived as something positive.

There is also an axiological scale, which includes seven elements: "very good" – "rather good" – "good" – "average" – "bad" – "rather bad" – "very bad" (Markelova/Маркелова, 1996). The sectors "good" – "bad" can be treated in a very abstract way, as they replace more specific axiological attributes. So *GOOD* and *BAD* seem to be general evaluative concepts with high metaphoric potential.

The positive and the negative zones seem to be asymmetrical in a natural language because "good" cannot always be opposed to "bad." The pragmatic aspect of evaluation does not admit the "+" / "–" symmetry. The language material proves that positive evaluation is more regularly focused on the speaker's attitude to a certain event (*success*), while negative evaluation specifies object properties and actions (*coward*). The analysis shows that in the language system, negative connotative fields seem to be more powerful than the fields with a positive connotation. For example, in English negative nouns denoting a person make 76% of the general number of nouns denoting a person (Byessonova/Бессонова, 2010). According to N. Arutyunova (Arutyunova/Арутюнова, 1999), positive evaluation is treated as the

primary and the basic one in language vocabulary, as negative senses are derived from the positive ones (*comfortable – uncomfortable, pleasant – unpleasant, pleasure – displeasure, happiness – unhappiness*). Vocabulary enrichment with positive evaluations, correlating with the norm, shows the pragmatic factor influence on the vocabulary. Concentrating on positive evaluations, a speaker tries to eliminate or soften unpleasant themes. In psycholinguistics, the emphasis on the positive edge of the axiological scale is called the “Polliana” principle (Osgood, 1980). Positive evaluation signals the object’s advantages and their prevalence. Negative evaluation indicates the object’s limitations and lack of advantages to compensate for it. The asymmetrical type of the axiological scale, where the norm is associated with the scale, a positive edge is considered to be universal and the most consistent. In this way, the positive norm is idealized.

The basic character of “good” and the derived nature of “bad” can be explained within the framework of the theory of natural morphology (Dressler/Дресслер, 1986; Mayerthaler, 1988). According to this theory, semantic (or conceptual) markedness coincides with the notion of derived markedness, i.e., category encoding is deeply rooted in people’s perception of the surrounding world. The natural, basic things are coded in a more transparent way; thus, basic (or semantically simpler) categories are characterized by unmarked coding (Mayerthaler, 1988). In the English evaluative thesaurus, the notions “semantically simple/complex” and “semantically basic/derived” do not coincide, i.e., “bad” is semantically simple, and “good” is semantically basic. As an anthropocentric category, evaluation depends on the system of norms and principles of a language community and is inseparable from the national specifics of the perception of the world by language speakers. Evaluation is characterized by a number of criteria, which are reflected in the national culture and which gain particular value importance,

expressed in the evaluative thesaurus. Thus, the evaluative thesaurus functions as an instrument of coding the values system of a linguocultural community.

Research methodology

The description of the evaluative thesaurus as an instrument of coding the linguocultural community values is based on the cognitive approach to the treatment of mental structures and language phenomena corresponding to them. The recognition of the fact that language data helps to reconstruct mental structures enables to establish the interaction between semantic and cognitive processes with the priority of the latter. Semantic processes are identified as the processes of verbalization, which express sign-referent relations. Cognitive processes occur in the human brain when visualizing and conceptualizing the processes and events of the surrounding reality. As a result, conceptual structures are built up bearing certain knowledge, which occasionally goes beyond the limits of pure semantics. Knowledge embodied by conceptual structures is broader than meaning. The cognitive approach to word semantics assumes that word meaning is constituted not only by the features necessary and sufficient to identify the denotatum but by the sum total of knowledge about the denotatum irrelative of the degree to which this knowledge is expressed in the language. These meanings incorporate the extra-linguistic experience of a language community, the sum total of intra- and extra-linguistic information within a word. In such a way, the lexical meaning is connected to its conceptual basis, which enables, to a certain degree, to reconstruct the concept by its language expression.

The analysis of publications in the field of cognitive linguistics reveals a strong theoretical and methodological basis, where there coexist various approaches (Karasik/Карасик, Krasavskii /Красавский, Slyshkin/Слышкин 2009; Когнитивная лингвистика /КОГНИТИВНАЯ ЛИНГВИСТИКА 2011; Kubryakova/Кубрякова 2001;

Levitskii/Левицкий 2016; Lingvokontseptologiya: perspektivnye napravleniya/Лингвоконцептология: перспективные направления/ 2013; Kolesov/Колесов, Pimenova/Пименова 2011; Potapenko/Потапенко, 2009; Prikhod'ko/Приходько, 2008; Sternin/Стернин, 2016; Croft, Cruse, 2004; Fauconnier, 1994; Fillmore, 1985; Geeraerts 2006; Historical Cognitive Linguistics 2010; Lakoff 1990; Langacker 1987, 1991; Taylor 2006). According to V. Maslova, “the method of cognitive science is, first and foremost, an attempt to combine the data from various fields, harmonize these data and find the sense of semantic continuity” (Maslova/Маслова, 2004, p. 44).

Cognitive linguistics employs a wide range of research procedures with different present-day linguistic theories being a ground for an adequate and manifold conceptual analysis (Kognitivnye issledovaniya yazyka/Когнитивные исследования языка, 2011; Protседuri kontseptual'nogo analizu v rıznostrukturnikh movakh/Процедури концептуального аналізу в різноструктурних мовах, 2012). Linguistic conceptology is one of the branches of cognitive linguistics with its own terminology and principles of language research, which employs various methods including propositional approach, categorization theory, conceptual analysis, frame modeling, conceptual metaphor approach, “mental spaces” theory, cognitive mapping, etc. One fact remains indisputable, namely, that the choice of a method depends on the research objectives.

Conceptualization and categorization

One of the cognitive science objectives is the identification of mechanisms of thinking and categorization structure. Cognitive linguistics deals with the correlation between language and mentality in general, and the interpretation of mechanisms related to transmitting concepts with language means in particular. In other words, cognitive linguistics focuses on the processes of categorization and verbalization, which presuppose the linguistic representation of

concepts through certain meanings, grammatical forms, syntactical structures. Conceptualization and categorization are classificatory processes that differ in their aims and results. Conceptualization is aimed at identifying the minimal content units of human experience and knowledge structures, whereas categorization has a purpose of uniting the units of the kind or identical ones into bigger categories (Kratkii slovar' kognitivnykh terminov/ Краткий словарь КОГНИТИВНЫХ ТЕРМИНОВ, 1997, p. 93). E. Selivanova defines the connection between conceptualization and categorization in the following way: "The former is directed at organizing ideal interconnected structures in the mind, the latter is supposed to integrate these structures into the hierarchy of classes according to the principle 'from concrete to general' as well as the principle of family resemblance within the categorial network" (Selivanova/Селіванова, 2010, p. 299-300).

A number of convergences and divergences characterize the conceptualization of the world in various linguocultural communities. Despite a certain degree of limitation in intercultural communication, the isomorphic variety of semantic elements is a basis found in all languages. However, the mere existence of lexicalized universals does not mean absolute equivalence in language use, because the semantic systems of different languages are unique and reflect the corresponding cultures.

It is also worth mentioning that there has long been a need for a systemic description of concepts as mental structures reflected in the language, as well as a sufficient description of such parts of the conceptual model of the world as the one associated with the values system of a cultural community. As part of the conceptual model of the world, the system of values is verbalized in the language evaluative thesaurus. The research of its hierarchical character is suggested in (Byessonova/Бессонова, 2003). The paper in question offers theoretical premises of the language evaluative thesaurus analysis,

with thesaurus being viewed as a hierarchical model. The key assumption is that a natural language serves as an instrument for the reality cognition and as an embodiment of world perception by a human. Thus, the functions of the language are nominating objects of the world, building up and transmitting notions and thoughts. It is only fair that the evaluative thesaurus is considered to be a complex means of verbalizing the universal values. Going in line with the suggested hypothesis and grounding on the corpus of the English evaluative lexical units as well as on the linguistic experiment results, the values hierarchy of the English speaking community has been developed, with the principal features of the English evaluative thesaurus being highlighted.

Ideographic approach to the description of vocabulary systemic organization

Language mentality is reflected by means of systemic organization principles, first, at the lexical level. The systemic nature of lexis, with various types of semantic fields of a hierarchical type in particular, synonymic, antonymic, homonymic, and other types of microsystems are looked upon in (Trier 1973, Ufimtseva/Уфимцева, 2010, Karaulov/Караулов, 2000, Apresyan/Апресян, 2009, Uberman 2006), as well as in lexicographic works (thesauruses, ideographic dictionaries, dictionaries of synonyms, antonyms, homonyms, etc.). One of the examples of a new approach to the language lexical system research is “The Russian semantic dictionary” edited by N. Shvedova (Russkii semanticheskii slovar'/Русский семантический словарь, 1998). Kühn (1979) sheds some light on an interesting effort of applying a complex system of semantic parameters when analyzing the German vocabulary. The author strives for creating a communication-aimed paradigmatic dictionary of the basic German vocabulary combining the onomasiological, and the semasiological approaches.

The English evaluative thesaurus is a constituent part of the language vocabulary and contains systematic information about the concrete and abstract notions possessing a value significance for a language user. According to (Karaulov/Караулов, 1981), a thesaurus is looked upon from two perspectives, i.e., as a dictionary and as a worldview. Y. Karaulov admits that the view-of-the-world thesaurus is constantly changing, although it can be recorded as a dictionary-thesaurus. The thesaurus of different language speakers and the thesaurus of the same language speaker but fixed at different moments will not coincide. Despite this, there is a possibility of finding a core, or invariant, common for different individual thesauruses that makes understanding possible.

Thus, a semantic description has to be formulated by means of universal concepts being the core of a vocabulary. By “the basic lexical core”, M. Swadesh means the following vocabulary units: 1) the ones with universal or almost universal meanings in the sense that in all (or almost all) languages, they are expressed by simple language forms (i.e., words or morphemes); 2) the ones with a high-frequency value in everyday communication (not in the scientific style or any other specialized style); and 3) the ones, which in all languages show the greatest resistance before historical changes or borrowing (Swadesh, 1955). “The basic lexical core” is formed under the influence of cognitive and communicative factors.

The compilation of the basic lexical core list and the limits of the evaluative thesaurus enables to create the necessary ground for further analysis of this communicatively important layer of the language vocabulary, including the comparative aspect. It is important to mention a discovery made by M. Swadesh, consisting in the fact that the main part of the vocabulary (the basic lexical core) in all languages changes and updates at a constant rate (Swadesh, 1955, p. 300). This means that singling out and describing the basic concepts of the evaluative thesaurus enables us to reveal and compare the universal

and divergent features in the values system of different language communities.

Language material and analysis procedure

The problem of limiting the corpus under analysis is one of the research challenges. The suggested method of distinguishing lexical units as parts of the English evaluative thesaurus consists of several stages. The first stage involved identifying the preliminary set of basic evaluative concepts, which constitute the English evaluative thesaurus. The basic vocabulary corpus included evaluative nouns, adjectives, verbs, adverbs selected by means of continuous sampling from the ideographic dictionary Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English by McArthur (LLCE). The basic sampling was supplemented from Roget's II Electronic Thesaurus (RET). In the second stage, a method of componential analysis was applied in order to study dictionary meanings of the selected units. The analysis addressed those dictionary entries, in which the meanings of evaluative concepts' components were indicated. For this matter, a number of authoritative dictionaries of the English language were explored. The empirical material was also supplemented by contexts from fictional and publicist texts, namely by various by content male and female evaluative utterances.

The basic empirical corpus numbers 5000 evaluative lexical units, which makes 14% from the total body of the dictionary (LLCE). The extension of the evaluative thesaurus from other dictionaries resulted in 2600 more evaluative units. On the ground of the quantitative analysis, it should be admitted that the core evaluative vocabulary (2/3 of the empirical corpus), i.e., which is a constituent part of the basic dictionaries, appears to be richer in evaluative connotations than the peripheral vocabulary (1/3 of the empirical corpus). We should point out that the share of stylistically marked substandard units in the empirical corpus is limited. The inclusion of the stylistically marked

substandard evaluative units would have enlarged the evaluative thesaurus. However, such words are typical of specialized dictionaries (e.g., of colloquial English, of slang). The ideographic dictionaries register stylistically marked evaluative words characterized by a high-frequency value.

The conceptual analysis involves the use of a range of methods, namely: “the semantic analysis of the words denoting names of concepts; etymological analysis of these words; the semantic analysis of the figurative, associative meanings embodied in concepts; interpretational semantic analysis of the contexts, in which the words and word-combinations denoting and verbalizing concepts are used; interpretational cultural analysis of associations related to a certain concept; interpretational analysis of evaluative utterances (maxims, proverbs, sayings) related to certain concepts; analysis of informants’ verbal reactions in associative experiments” (Karasik/Карасик, 2005, p. 33).

The present research objectives determined the employment of the semantic analysis of concept names to define the semantic volume of units, verbalizing them along with the etymological features of these units, as well as using the interpretational linguocultural analysis of the denotational, notional, and figurative components of evaluative concepts to detect culture-marked conceptual traits and evaluative dominants of the language community. In the course of the conceptual analysis, the concept meaning was presented as a frame structure. The cognitive mechanisms of evaluative semantics, as well as functional peculiarities of evaluative lexical units, have been identified.

Results and discussion

The analysis of the language material revealed that it is a human or a person who is the core and the key notion of any classification. This centrality of a human in classifications is always factual. Linguists engaged in the process of ideographic dictionaries compilation stress

its importance. The semantic volume and differentiation of this notion may vary in different languages and are accounted for by the speakers' national peculiarities and the social structure of the society. There are numerous lists of notions, constituting the thesaurus of the national community language and culture (Stepanov/Степанов, 1997).

In the cause of the analysis, a conclusion is made that the evaluative thesaurus is constituted by axiological and parametrical concepts distinguished by the importance of the subject and the object, in other words, by the pragmatic relevance of the object expressed through the value and measure forms. The basis of axiological evaluation is the pragmatic importance in the form of value. The basis of parametrical evaluation is parametrical features of events and objects, namely, scale, size, intensity, force, quantity, quality, and other parameters, acquiring the speakers' social and normative evaluation.

It is worth mentioning that from the perspective of concept typology (Vorkachev/Воркачев, 2003, 2005, Karasik/Карасик, 2005), non-parametrical concepts appear to be of special interest (in contrast to such parametrical concepts as space, time, quantity, and quality). The heterogeneity of non-parametrical concepts is caused by the possibility to classify them into regulatory and non-regulatory (syncretic mental entities of different nature, like voyage, gift, and health). "Regulatory concepts express the evaluative code of a certain linguoculture" (Karasik/Карасик, 2005, p. 31). In their turn, "regulatory concepts" are not homogeneous, which means that it is possible to single out teleonomic concepts among them. Teleonomic concepts are defined as verbalized data connected with the spiritual culture universals and which are of crucial importance for a person" (Vorkachev/Воркачев, 2003, p. 4). It is the regulatory concepts that are of particular interest in distinguishing peculiarities of a speaking community mentality.

The English evaluative thesaurus can be presented as a network model, in which concepts are grouped into semantic clusters

associated with basic evaluative concepts. The semantics of basic concepts is analyzed in terms of part-of-speech characteristics of the evaluative lexical units verbalizing them. The basic concepts are fixed in the cognition, reflect various spheres of human activity, and facilitate mental processes. These concepts supply us with an experimental context, in which the perceived ideas can be adapted and understood. The cognitive role of the English evaluative thesaurus elements lies in modeling the lexical units' semantic meaning through corresponding propositions. This important role manifests itself in systemic speech realizations and in the language analogy.

The construction of the list of the evaluative thesaurus main lexical core, as well as the evaluative thesaurus limits, is a prerequisite enabling further analysis of the development of this communicatively important vocabulary layer, including the gender aspect perspective. The detection and description of the evaluative thesaurus components (i.e., its basic concepts) contribute to exposing the convergent and divergent features of the evaluative worldview of male and female speakers.

The basic evaluative thesaurus in English numbers at least 7620 lexical units arranged into 91 groups. 7592 words form 90 groups verbalizing separate concepts. One group is represented by evaluative lexical units, which remained outside the classification as their semantics does not correspond to any suggested criterion, or the number of potential groups does not meet the minimal quantitative requirement.

As a systemic network model, the evaluative thesaurus most adequately reflects the hierarchy of the speaking community values. 11 clusters of the network model are made up by groups of concepts, among them are general concepts, concepts of emotions, social concepts, biological concepts, concepts of moral qualities, traits of character of a person, concepts of state, concepts of action, concepts of relations, parametrical concepts, concepts of perception, gender

concepts. There are at least 28 core concepts (e.g., *LOVE*, *ADMIRATION*, *RIGHT*, *WRONG*, *EVIL* (general evaluation), *GOOD* (general evaluation), *LAW*, *ORDER*, *POWER*, *APPEARANCE*, *LIE*, *TREACHERY*, *HONESTY*, *LOYALTY*, *COMMUNICATING*, *DEATH*, *WAR*, *STRENGTH*, *EASY*, etc.). The concepts with a more concrete integral seme are verbalized by a lower number of evaluative words, which means that the concept nominative density is related to the type of the integral seme.

The evaluative thesaurus network model can be presented as a four-level hierarchy of values. The concept's hierarchical arrangement is a complicated process due to the absence of clear limits of the network model clusters, as well as due to the fact that hierarchization is only possible in the core part of the thesaurus. Four axiological levels of the values hierarchy are singled out, namely: *sensory* values, related to the sensory experience (*DESIRE*, *FEAR*, *UNEASINESS*, *ANXIETY*, *CONCERN*, *GRIEF*, *SORROW*, *SADNESS*, *DANGER*, *THREAT*, *LUCK*, *DESPAIR*, *DISAPPOINTMENT*); *vital or life* values, connected with physiological and psychological activities, states, relations that are axiological important for a person (*FRIENDSHIP – ENMITY*, *LIFE – DEATH*, *FREEDOM – SLAVERY*, *PEACE – WAR*, *HEALTH – ILLNESS*); *spiritual* values, related to moral and ethical norms (*KINDNESS – UNKINDNESS*, *HONESTY*, *LOYALTY – LIE*, *TREACHERY*, *COURAGE*, *BRAVERY – COWARDICE*); as well as the *absolute* values, which are connected with faith in a broad sense (*FAITH*, *BELIEF*). General evaluative concepts *GOOD – EVIL* are concepts of the highest abstraction degree, consequently traced at all levels of the axiological hierarchy. Thus, the scale with the “good” and “bad” zones is prototypical in the lexical units' analysis.

The analysis revealed that the evaluation conceptual core is made up of frequently used words in their direct meaning that are close to the cognitive prototype. As a rule, the concept's core words are coded in a simpler way, which means that they mainly are structurally non-

derivative units of an optimal length, denoting the simplest and natural ideas from the extra-linguistic point of view. These observations serve as an evidence of the natural morphology mechanisms in action (Mayerthaler, 1988) when speaking of the semantic peculiarities of the English evaluative thesaurus. Thus, the English evaluative thesaurus is a system with a hierarchical structure, based on the nucleus/periphery principle and incorporating conceptual universals. The thesaurus iconicity means not a semantic (i.e., the subject-object connection) but a pragmatic relation (i.e., the connection between designation, an object, and a speaker).

Within the framework of the research, a linguistic experiment was carried out in the course of which 100 English speakers were interviewed. The participants of the associative experiment were encouraged to arrange their verbal reactions to the given stimuli in order of importance, beginning with the most significant ones. The respondents' reactions to the given stimuli made up a basis for the description of the basic concepts in the English evaluative thesaurus and the peculiarities of the evaluation expression in the communicative behavior of male and female English speakers. The experiment data enabled to identify the hierarchy of values in the English language model of the world (Byessonova, 2012).

The experiment data cast light upon the fact that language means used by men and women to verbalize the core concepts of the English evaluative thesaurus appear to be different. According to the responses of the people interviewed, the language means used by the men, in contrast to the ones used by the women, seem to be less diverse. The quantitative analysis results of the peculiarities of the language means employed by both genders to express their ideas about the evaluative concepts are presented in table 1.

Pattern	Women's reactions (%)	Men's reactions (%)	Example
N	54	59	<i>injustice, stress, ignorance, confrontation, chaos</i>
Adj	34	29	<i>successful, organized, honest, responsible, popular</i>
Adj + N	4	2.5	<i>nice person, old age, uncontrollable fear</i>
Adj + Adj	2	–	<i>strict and harsh, immoral and dishonest</i>
N + N	1	3	<i>responsibility control, intelligence respect</i>
N + prep + N	3	2	<i>mind over matter, regulation of chaos, commitment to friends, search for wisdom</i>
N is ...	0.5	–	<i>The best love is unconditional; Right is something a person perceives as correct</i>
V + N	0.5	0.5	<i>to lack will, to respect integrity</i>
Others	1	4	<i>no challenge, others' favorable perception, feeling helplessness</i>
Total	100	100	

Table 1. *Quantitative analysis of the language means used by men and women to express evaluative concepts*

The language material analysis indicates that, on the whole, both men and women employ identical means expressing their ideas concerning the English evaluative thesaurus. However, the results of the conducted quantitative analysis prove that males' communicative behavior, compared to that of females', is characterized by more frequent use of nouns (table 1) and N+N structures when defining evaluative concepts. The structure N+N was seldom or never used by women in their responses to the stimuli. As compared to men's speech, women's communication is similarly characterized by frequent use of nouns, though to a lesser degree. A larger part of women's speech belongs to adjectives (table 1). There is a trend in women's speech to use the patterns Adj+N, N+prep+N more frequently than men do (see examples in Table 1). The patterns Adj+Adj and N is ..., that are traced in women's speech, were not used by men.

The comparative analysis of the peculiarities of the evaluative concepts' verbalization in men's and women's speech enabled to distinguish the language units that function as the keywords of the concepts, i.e., the units coinciding in males' and females' speech and used by more than 50 % of the respondents. The results of the experiment made it possible to make the following list of the core concepts' keywords in the English evaluative thesaurus (the keywords are italicized):

LOVE (like, fondness, happiness),
ADMIRATION (respect),
GRIEF, SORROW, SADNESS (depression, hurt),
UNEASINESS, ANXIETY, CONCERN (worry, nervous),
INTEREST, CURIOSITY (excitement),
RIGHT (correct, exact),
WRONG (incorrect),
EVIL (general evaluation) (bad),
GOOD (general evaluation) (right),

FAITH, BELIEF (hope, spiritual),
LAW, ORDER (justice),
POWER (strength, authority),
SOCIAL STATUS (popularity),
APPEARANCE (beautiful, ugly),
ILLNESS (sick, disease),
CLEANNESS (order, tidy),
LIE, TREACHERY (deceit, dishonesty),
HONESTY, LOYALTY (trust, friend),
FOOLISHNESS (stupid, idiotic),
SEVERENESS (harsh, strict),
KNOWLEDGE (wisdom, intelligence),
COMMUNICATING (understanding),
DEATH (sadness, loss),
WAR (death, fighting),
SIZE, AMOUNT (large, small, nothing),
WEAKNESS (not strong),
STRENGTH (power, force),
EASY (simple).

The observations testify to the fact that the value views of the males and females speaking the same language only partially coincide and appear to be individual for various respondents. As illustrated by the analysis results, the difference in the conceptual vision of the values is gender-dependent. This distinction is not related to biological peculiarities but is reasoned by the historical idea of the males' and females' roles and stereotypes deeply rooted in the mentality of the society, as well as by the cultural peculiarities of the society. The semantic content of the evaluative concepts is individual and depends on the respondents' gender, their age, educational background, occupation, personal interests. The intersection of the concepts semantic spaces is observed in the concepts' keywords that are prototypical objectivators of the semantic structure. As a result, the

perception of the prototypical part of the English evaluative thesaurus is common for all the linguocultural community.

The evaluative thesaurus research enables to reveal the cultural aspects of lexical nomination and aids in reconstructing the peculiarities of the social and cultural life of the given language representatives. The study of the cultural coding peculiarities, traced in the linguistic community's evaluative worldview, allows identifying the dominating types of cultural codes. The observations and results obtained in the process of the empirical analysis offer a way to limit the evaluative thesaurus corpus and to describe the semantics of its constituents, which is of crucial practical importance when teaching a foreign language as well as translation.

Reference List

- АПРЕСЯН, Юрий (2009): *Исследования по семантике и лексикографии*. Т. I: Парадигматика. М.: Языки славянских культур, 568 с. [APRESYAN, Yurii (2009): *Issledovaniya po semantike i leksikografii*. Т. I: Paradigmatika. Moscow: Yazyki slavyanskikh kul'tur, 568 p.]
- АРНОЛЬД, Ирина (1986): *Лексикология современного английского языка*. 3-е изд., перераб. и доп. Москва: Высшая школа, 295 с. [ARNOL'D, Irina (1986): *Leksikologiya sovremennogo angliiskogo yazyka*. 3-e izd., pererab. i dop. Moscow: Vysshaya shkola, 295 p.]
- АРУТЮНОВА, Нина (1999): *Язык и мир человека*. 2-е изд., испр. Москва : Языки русской культуры, I – XV, 896 с. [ARUTYUNOVA, Nina (1999): *Yazyk i mir cheloveka*. 2-e izd., ispr. Moscow : Yazyki russkoi kul'tury, I – XV, 896 p.]
- BOLINGER, Dwight (1972): *Degree Words*. The Hague – Paris: Mouton, 324 p.
- БЕССОНОВА, Ольга (2003): *Оценочный тезаурус английского языка: общая характеристика*. Вісник Харківського національного університету імені В.Н.Каразіна. Харків, Вип. 586. с. 14-17. [BYESSONOVA, Olga (2003): *Otsenochnyi tezaurus angliiskogo yazyka: obshchaya kharakteristika*. In Visnyk Kharkivs'kogo

- natsional'nogo universitetu imeni V.N. Karazina. Kharkiv, Vyp. 586. pp. 14-17.]
- БЕССОHOBA, Ольга (2010): *Структурные особенности оценочных наименований лица в английском, французском и украинском языках*. Записки з романо-германської філології. № 25, с. 7-14. [BYESSONOVA, Olga (2010): *Strukturnye osobennosti otsenochnykh naimenovaniy litsa v angliiskom, frantsuzskom i ukrainskom yazykakh*. In Zapiski z romano-germans'koi filologii. No. 25, pp. 7-14.]
- BYESSONOVA, Olga (2012): *Hierarchy of Values in the English Model of the World*. In O.L. Byessonova, N.I. Panasenko (collection of papers / editors-in-chief): *Humanities across the Borders*. Donetsk – Trnava: DonNU, pp. 5-24.
- BYESSONOVA, Olga (2012): *Reconstruction of Value concepts in the Language Model of the World*. In M. Ferenčík, K. Bednárová-Gibová (eds.): *Language, Literature and Culture in a Changing Transatlantic World II*. (Part I. Linguistics, Translation, Cultural Studies). Prešov, 2012. pp. 13-21.
- CROFT, William, CRUSE, Alan (2004): *Cognitive Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- ДРЕССЛЕР, Вольфганг (1986): *Об объяснительной силе естественной морфологии*. Вопросы языкознания. № 5, с. 33-46. [DRESSLER, Vol'fgang (1986): *Ob ob'yasnitel'noi sile estestvennoi morfologii*. In *Voprosy yazykoznaniiya*. No. 5, pp. 33-46.]
- FAUCONNIER, Gilles (1994): *Mental Spaces*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- FILLMORE, Charles (1985). *Frames and the Semantics of Understanding*. In *Quaderni di Semantica*. 6(2), pp. 222-253.
- GEERAERTS, Dirk (2006): *Methodology in Cognitive Linguistics*. In G. Kristiansen, M. Achard, R. Dirven, F.J. Ruiz de Mendoza Ibáñez (eds.): *Cognitive Linguistics: Current Applications and Future Perspectives*. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 21-50.
- Historical Cognitive Linguistics* (2010): Ed. by M.E. Winters, H. Tissari, K. Allan. Berlin / New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 360 p.
- КАРАСИК Владимир, КРАСАВСКИЙ Николай, СЛЫШКИН Геннадий (2009): *Лингвокультурная концептология*. Волгоград: Парадигма, 116 с. [KARASIK Vladimir, KRASAVSKII Nikolai, SLYSHKIN Gennadii (2009): *Lingvokul'turnaya kontseptologiya*. Volgograd: Paradigma, 116 p.]

- КАРАСИК, Владимир (2005): *Иная ментальность*. Москва: Гнозис, 349 с. [KARASIK, Vladimir (2005): *Inaya mental'nost'*. Moscow: Gnozis, 349 p.]
- КАРАУЛОВ, Юрий (1981): *Лингвистическое конструирование и тезаурус литературного языка*. Москва: Наука, 367 с. [KARAULOV, Yurii (1981): *Lingvisticheskoe konstruirovaniye i tezaurus literaturnogo yazyuka*. Moscow: Nauka, 367 p.]
- КАРАУЛОВ, Юрий (2000): *Показатели национального менталитета в ассоциативно-вербальной сети*. Языковое сознание и образ мира: сборник статей. Отв. ред. Н.В. Уфимцева. Москва, С. 191-206. [KARAULOV, Yurii (2000): *Pokazateli natsional'nogo mentaliteta v assotsiativno-verbal'noi seti*. In *Yazykovoe soznanie i obraz mira: sbornik statei*. Отв. ред. N.V. Ufimtseva. Moscow, pp. 191-206.]
- Когнитивная лингвистика: новые парадигмы и новые решения* (2011) Серия "Концептуальные исследования": сб. статей / отв. ред. М.В. Пименова. Москва: ИЯ РАН, Вып. 15. 896 с. [Kognitivnaya lingvistika: novye paradigmy i novye resheniya (2011) Seriya "Kontseptual'nye issledovaniya": sb. statei / отв. ред. M.V. Pimenova. Moscow: IYA RAN, Vyp. 15. 896 p.]
- Когнитивные исследования языка* (2011): сб. науч. тр. / гл. ред. серии Е.С. Кубрякова, отв. ред. вып. В.З. Демьянков. Москва: Ин-т языкознания РАН; Тамбов: Издательский дом ТГУ им. Г.Р. Державина. Вып. IX. Взаимодействие когнитивных и языковых структур. 562 с. [Kognitivnyye issledovaniya yazyuka (2011): sb. nauch. tr. / gl. red. serii E.S. Kubryakova, отв. ред. vyp. V.Z. Dem'yankov. Moscow: In-t yazykoznananiya RAN; Tambov: Izdatel'skii dom TGU im. G.R. Derzhavina. Vyp. IX. Vzaimodeistvie kognitivnykh i yazykovykh struktur. 562 p.]
- КОЛЕСОВ, Виктор, ПИМЕНОВА, Марина (2011): *Языковые основы русской ментальности*. СПб.: СПбГУ, 136 с. [KOLESOV, Viktor, PIMENOVA, Marina (2011): *Yazykovye osnovy russkoi mental'nosti*. Sakt-Peterburg: SPbGU, 136 p.]
- Краткий словарь когнитивных терминов* (1997): под ред. Е.С. Кубряковой. Москва: Филологический факультет МГУ им. М.В. Ломоносова, 245 с. [Kratkii slovar' kognitivnykh terminov (1997): pod red. E.S. Kubryakovoi. Moscow: Filologicheskii fakul'tet MGU im. M.V. Lomonosova, 245 p.]

- КУБРЯКОВА, Елена (2001): *О когнитивной лингвистике и семантике термина «когнитивный»*. Вестник ВГУ. Серия «Лингвистика и межкультурная коммуникация». Вып. 1. С. 4-10. [KUBRYAKOVA, Elena (2001): *O kognitivnoi lingvistike i semantike termina «kognitivnyi»*. In Vestnik VGU. Seriya «Lingvistika i mezhkul'turnaya kommunikatsiya». Vyp. 1. pp. 4-10.]
- КУНИН, Александр (1980): *Механизм окказиональной фразеологической номинации и проблема оценки* : сборник научных трудов МГПИИЯ имени М. Тореца. Москва : МГПИИЯ. Вып. 168. С. 158-185. [KUNIN, Aleksandr (1980): *Mekhanizm okkazional'noi frazeologicheskoi nominatsii i problema otsenki* : sbornik nauchnykh trudov MGPIYA imeni M. Toreza. Moscow : MGPIYA. Vyp. 168. pp. 158-185.]
- КУНИН, Александр (1996): *Курс фразеологии английского языка*. 2-е изд. Москва : Высшая школа Дубна, Изд. центр «Феникс», 381 с. [KUNIN, Aleksandr (1996): *Kurs frazeologii angliiskogo yazyka*. 2-e izd. Moscow : Vysshaya shkola Dubna, Izd. tsentr «Feniks», 381 p.]
- KÜHN, Peter (1979). *Der Grundwortschatz. Bestimmung und Systematisierung*. Reihe Germanistische Linguistik, 17. Tübingen: Niemeyer, 192 p.
- LAKOFF, George (1990): *Women, Fire and Dangerous Things*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 614 p.
- LAKOFF, George, JOHNSON, Mark (1980): *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago, London: The University of Chicago Press, 242 p.
- LANGACKER, Ronald (1987): *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. Vol. 1: Theoretical Prerequisites.
- LANGACKER, Ronald (1987): *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar*. Stanford: Stanford University Press. Vol. 2: Descriptive Application.
- ЛЕВИЦКИЙ, Андрей (2016): *Перспективные направления исследований в сфере межкультурной коммуникации*. Вестник Московской международной академии. № 1. С. 74-81. [LEVITSKII, Andrei (2016): *Perspektivnye napravleniya issledovaniy v sfere mezhkul'turnoi kommunikatsii*. In Vestnik Moskovskoi mezhdunarodnoi akademii. No. 1. pp. 74-81.]
- Лингвоконцептология: перспективные направления* (2013): Ред.: А.Э. Левицкий, С.И. Потапенко, И.В. Недайнова. Луганск : Изд-во ГУ ЛНУ имени Тараса Шевченко, 624 с. [Lingvokontseptologiya: *perspektivnye napravleniya* (2013): Red.: A.E. Levitskii, S.I. Potapenko,

- I. V. Nedainova. Lugansk: Izd-vo GU LNU imeni Tarasa Shevchenko, 624 p.]
- МАРКЕЛОВА, Татьяна (1996): *Семантика оценки и средства ее выражения в русском языке*: автореф. дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. Москва. 47 с. [MARKELOVA, Tat'yana (1996): *Semantika otsenki i sredstva ee vyrazheniya v russkom yazyke*: avtoref. dis. ... d-ra filol. nauk. Moscow. 47 p.]
- МАСЛОВА, Валентина (2004): *Когнитивная лингвистика*. Минск : ТетраСистемс, 266 с. [MASLOVA, Valentina (2004): *Kognitivnaya lingvistika*. Minsk: TetraSistems, 266 p.]
- МАУЕРТГАЛЕР, Willi (1988): *Morphological naturalness*. Ann Arbor: Karoma Publishers, Inc., 150 p.
- OSGOOD, Charles (1980): *The Cognitive Dynamics of Synaesthesia and Metaphor*. In Honeck and Hoffman. (eds.): *Cognition and Figurative Language*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, pp. 203-238.
- ПОТАПЕНКО, Сергій (2009): *Сучасний англомовний медіа-дискурс: лінгвокогнітивний і мотиваційний аспекти*. Ніжин: Видавництво НДУ імені Миколи Гоголя, 391 с. [POTAPENKO, Sergii (2009): *Suchasniy anglotovnii media-diskurs: lingvokognitivniy i motivatsiiniy aspekti*. Nizhin: Vidavnitstvo NDU imeni Mikoli Gogolya, 391 p.]
- ПРИХОДЬКО, Анатолій (2008): *Концепти і концептосистеми в когнітивно-дискурсивній парадигмі лінгвістики*. Запоріжжя: Прем'єр, 332 с. [PRIKHOD'KO, Anatolii (2008): *Kontsepti i kontseptosistemi v kognitivno-diskursivnii paradigmi lingvistiki*. Zaporizhzhya: Prem'yer, 332 p.]
- Процедури концептуального аналізу в різноструктурних мовах* (2012): колективна монографія: за заг. ред. О.Л. Бессонової. Донецьк : ДонНУ, 361 с. [Protседuri kontseptual'nogo analizu v rıznostrukturnikh tovakh (2012): kolektivna monografiya: za zag. red. O.L. Vyessonovoyi. Donets'k: DonNU, 361 p.]
- Русский семантический словарь. Толковый словарь, систематизированный по классам слов и значений* (1998): под общ. ред. Н.Ю. Шведовой. Москва : Азбуковник, Т. 1. 804 с. [Russkii semanticheskii slovar'. Tolkovyi slovar', sistematizirovannyi po klassam slov i znachenii (1998): pod obshch. red. N.Yu. Shvedovoi. Moscow: Azbukovnik, T. 1. 804 p.]
- СЕЛІВАНОВА, Олена (2010): *Лінгвістична енциклопедія*. Полтава : Довкілля-К, 844 с. [SELIVANOVA, Olena (2010): *Lingvistichna*

- entsiklopediya*. Poltava: Dovkillya-K, 844 p.]
- СТЕПАНОВ, Юрий (1997): *Константы. Словарь русской культуры: Опыт исследования*. Москва : Школа “Языки русской культуры”, 824 с. [STEPANOV, Yurii (1997): *Konstanty. Slovar' russkoi kul'tury: Opyt issledovaniya*. Moscow: Shkola “Yazyki russkoi kul'tury”, 824 p.]
- СТЕРНИН, Иосиф (2016): *Теоретические и прикладные проблемы языкознания. Избранные работы*. Часть 1. DirectMEDIA. Москва – Берлин, 547 с. Часть 2. DirectMEDIA. Москва – Берлин, 532 с. [STERNIN, Iosif (2016): *Teoreticheskie i prikladnye problemy yazykoznaniiya. Izbrannye raboty*. Chast' 1. DirectMEDIA. Moscow – Berlin, 547 p. Chast' 2. DirectMEDIA. Moscow – Berlin, 532 p.]
- SWADESH, Michael (1955): *Toward Greater Accuracy in Lexicostatistic Dating*. In *International Journal of American Linguistics*. 21. 1955. pp. 121-137.
- TAYLOR, John (2006): *Linguistic Categorization*. 3d ed. New York: Oxford University Press, 308 p.
- TRIER, Jost (1973): *Aufsätze und Vorträge zur Wortfeldtheorie*, ed. by A. van der Lee and O. Reichman. The Hague: Mouton, 216 S.
- UBERMAN, Agnieszka (2006): *Modelling the English Lexicon in Applied Linguistics*. Rzesz.: w: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Rzeszowskiego, 226 p.
- УФИМЦЕВА, Анна (2010): *Лексическое значение. Принцип семиологического описания лексики*. Москва: Книжный дом LIBROKOM, 240 с. [UFIMTSEVA, Anna (2010): *Leksicheskoe znachenie. Printsip semiologicheskogo opisaniya leksiki*. Moscow: Knizhnyi dom LIBROKOM, 240 p.]
- ВОЛЬФ, Елена (2002): *Функциональная семантика оценки*. Москва: Едиториал УРСС, 280 с. [VOL'F, Elena (2002): *Funktsional'naya semantika otsenki*. Moscow: Editorial URSS, 280 p.]
- ВОРКАЧЕВ, Сергей (2003): *Сопоставительная этносемантика телеономных концептов «любовь» и «счастье» (русско-английские параллели)*. Волгоград: Перемена, 164 с. [VORKACHEV, Sergei (2003): *Sopostavitel'naya etnosemantika teleonomnykh kontseptov «lyubov'» i «s chast'e» (russko-angliiskie paralleli)*. Volgograd : Peremena, 164 p.]
- ВОРКАЧЕВ, Сергей (2005): *Лингвоконцептология и межкультурная коммуникация: истоки и цели. Филологические науки. № 4. С. 76-83*. [VORKACHEV, Sergei (2005): *Lingvokontseptologiya i*

mezhkul'turnaya kommunikatsiya: istoki i tseli. In *Filologicheskie nauki*.
No. 4. pp. 76-83.]

Lexicographic sources

Longman Lexicon of Contemporary English (1998). Ed. by T. McArthur.
Longman Group Limited, 913 p. [LLCE].

Roget's II Electronic Thesaurus (1993). In Microsoft Bookshelf CD-ROM
reference library. Wearnes. [RET].