

Торайғыров университетінің
ҒЫЛЫМИ ЖУРНАЛЫ

НАУЧНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ
Торайғыров университета

**ТОРАЙҒЫРОВ
УНИВЕРСИТЕТІНІҢ
ХАБАРШЫСЫ**

Филологиялық серия
1997 жылдан бастап шығады



**ВЕСТНИК
ТОРАЙҒЫРОВ
УНИВЕРСИТЕТА**

Филологическая серия
Издается с 1997 года

ISSN 2710-3528

№3 (2023)

Павлодар

**НАУЧНЫЙ ЖУРНАЛ
ТОРАЙГЫРОВ УНИВЕРСИТЕТА**

Филологическая серия
выходит 4 раза в год

СВИДЕТЕЛЬСТВО

О постановке на переучет периодического печатного издания,
информационного агентства и сетевого издания

№ KZ30VRY00029268

выдано

Министерством информации и общественного развития
Республики Казахстан

Тематическая направленность
публикация материалов в области филологии

Подписной индекс – 76132

<https://doi.org/10.48081/GLPR6468>

Бас редакторы – главный редактор

Жусупов Н. К.

д.ф.н., профессор

Заместитель главного редактора

Анесова А. Ж., *доктор PhD*

Ответственный секретарь

Уайханова М. А., *доктор PhD*

Редакция алқасы – Редакционная коллегия

Дементьев В. В., *д.ф.н., профессор (Российская Федерация)*

Еспенбетов А. С., *д.ф.н., профессор*

Трушев А. К., *д.ф.н., профессор*

Маслова В. А., *д.ф.н., профессор (Белоруссия)*

Пименова М. В., *д.ф.н., профессор (Российская Федерация)*

Баратова М. Н., *д.ф.н., профессор*

Аймухамбет Ж. А., *д.ф.н., профессор*

Шапауов Ә. Қ., *к.ф.н., профессор*

Шокубаева З. Ж., *технический редактор*

За достоверность материалов и рекламы ответственность несут авторы и рекламодатели

Редакция оставляет за собой право на отклонение материалов

При использовании материалов журнала ссылка на «Вестник Торайгыров университета» обязательна

<https://doi.org/10.48081/NBQN4038>

***K. B. Dautbayeva¹, K. K. Duisekova²**

L. N. Gumilyov Eurasian National University,
Republic of Kazakhstan, Astana

*e-mail: dautbaeva.k@mail.ru

NATIONAL-CULTURAL CHARACTER OF EVALUATIVE MEANING LANGUAGE STRUCTURES IN KAZAKH AND ENGLISH

The article is devoted to the consideration of the national cultural nature of evaluative language structures in the Kazakh and English languages. In this article, we set out to reveal the relationship of evaluative language structures in Kazakh and English with the national worldview. The article analyzes the activities of evaluative language structures (parables and idioms, proverbs) in the Kazakh and English languages to represent a conceptual picture of the world. The relevance of the research is manifested in the fact that the evaluation determines the spiritual culture of the nation, the conceptual picture of the world in its worldview by considering the use of evaluative meaning language structures in combination with the national worldview.

In the study and systematization of theoretical material, general scientific methods of analysis, synthesis and deduction, as well as lexicosemantic analysis, comparative research methods were used.

In modern linguistic research, various aspects of the study of evaluation are presented. In today's linguistics, we cannot say that the problem of value, evaluation is one of the most fully studied. Especially the linguocultural aspect of the evaluation category is one of the issues that needs to be studied. This article is considered a contribution to research in this field. The results of the study can be used in research in the fields of «Linguoculturology», «Cognitive linguistics», «Linguoaxiology».

The conclusions obtained as a result of the study can serve as an impetus for a deeper study of the Kazakh and English evaluative vocabulary in the linguocultural direction.

Keywords: linguoculturology, conceptual picture of the world, cognitive linguistics, evaluation category, language, culture.

Introduction

In modern linguistics, special attention is paid to the study of the facts of language from a linguocultural, semantic, pragmatic, ethnolinguistic, functional and cognitive point of view.

Humanity learns about the world by revealing the natural functions of things and classifying their phenomena based on the experience that it sees, learns, acquires in life. The real phenomena of life are characterized in terms of valuable quality, such as *good* and *evil*, *goodness* and *evil*, benefit and harm, etc.

Evaluation is a special linguistic category that exists in language communication, a phenomenon of special social significance. The main function of evaluation is reasoning about a specific substance and phenomenon. The evaluation process is the result of human cognitive activity. The term «*evaluation*» is understood from the point of view of evaluation in the same way as the term «*expressing an evaluative opinion*». J. Austin shows evaluation in four main areas of language use, including *evaluation*, *description*, *expression* and *orectives* [1]. In linguistic research, the evaluation category is analyzed as a logical-grammatical, functional-semantic or functional-semantic-stylistic category.

The function of the cognitive direction in recognizing the nature of the linguistic units of evaluation is enormous. Cognitive linguistics is a means of systematization and construction of linguistics from the point of view of the linguistic picture of the world concepts. The evaluation category plays an important role in the formation of the conceptual picture of the world. The reason for this is that the evaluation reflects the opinion, personal tastes, worldview, mindset of the speaker, and therefore the evaluation is closely related to the thinking of people with their worldview, their understanding of the world. The term «*evaluation*», used in a narrow and broad sense, reflects various human relationships with the environment.

Materials and methods

In the course of the research, general scientific methods of analysis, synthesis and deduction were used to study and systematize theoretical material. The article discusses the relevance of the evaluation category in the Kazakh and English languages to the formation of a conceptual picture of the world in the linguocultural direction and cognitive approach. The methods of lexical and semantic analysis, comparative research in the reflection of evaluative meaning language structures in the construction of a conceptual picture of the world, linguistic and cultural character are used. The evaluation uses various manifestations, perspectives, motives, and different codes and approaches. Evaluation of the philosophical basis, as well as categories, is also called psychological (feelings, will, duty, etc., arising in the perception of objects), ontological (evaluation refers to the true properties

of the object, their compliance / non-compliance with the norm), conceptual, cognitive, philosophical or logical.

Results and discussion

As for evaluation, first of all, the versatility of the category «virtue», the subjectivity of the evaluative value is discussed in the works of T. Hobbes [2], J. Locke writes about the hedonistic concept of *bad* and *good* [3], and the Category of evaluation is reflected and considered in utilitarian directions by I. Kant [4].

The problem of evaluative meaning is studied in the works of Sh. Nurgozhina, B. Momynova, O. Burkitov, M. Sergaliev, A. Aldasheva, K. Yesenova F. Zhaksybayeva, Z. Yernazarova, etc., devoted to the style of journalism, newspaper text, pragmatic aspect.

In the study of G. A. Tusupbekova «the meaning of evaluation in the modern Kazakh language and its structural system» the linguistic nature of the evaluation category is comprehensively considered [5, 122].

In relation to news discourse, F. Zhaksybayeva's dissertation explores the pragmatic function of evaluative vocabulary [6, 21].

The scholar Arutyunova «Types of language values: Evaluation. The Event. Fact». In her fundamental research work considered the main philosophical conclusions regarding the nature of evaluation. The closest to the essence of the phenomenon of evaluation is the normative definition of the essence of evaluation, based on the theological principle. This definition takes into account the opposite of the meanings of evaluations – descriptive meanings, which are important for the language. The scholar classifies the meaning of evaluation as relational, that is, a meaning that establishes a correspondence between the world and its glorified model and is associated with modus [7, 29].

Zh. Mankeeva reasons: «the ability to see the bright future of the language in its diverse connection with a person, his strong mental, spiritual development, all thinking and truth knowledge processes for the knowledge of the world, life, as well as the mechanisms and structures that form the basis of it» [8, 39–43]

B. Momynova in her work «newspaper vocabulary: system and structure» focuses specifically on the evaluative vocabulary in the newspaper language. In the process of using evaluation as a language tool, the newspaper emphasizes that it has the opportunity to socially and politically evaluate individuals and other structural societies as ideological opponents of positive, negative phenomena, life changes in society [9, 134].

And the well-known researcher Z. Yernazarova in her research work «pragmalinguistic aspect of the syntax of the spoken language» makes the following conclusions: «Evaluation is represented on the basis of an act of speech. Therefore, acts of evaluative speech acquire the only pragmatic value. From the point of view of values inherent in humanity, pragmatic significance contributes to

the formation of speech that are used on the purpose of evaluating the phenomenon-actions. If the evaluation is given from a *positive* or *negative* point of view, there are units in the spoken language that are tuned to this goal» [10, 169].

Z. K. Temirgazina considers about the evaluation that: «Value is the meaning of the object for the subject – good, goodness, beauty, etc., and evaluation is the emotional and intellectual identification of this meaning by the subject – the experience of the good, the verdict of conscience, the judgment of taste, etc» [11, 10].

In research works in modern linguistics, there are several directions related to the meaning of evaluation, such as consideration from the point of view of semasiological, linguistic, pragmatic, system-level, cognitive, typological, communicative, lexicographic aspects. All of them reflect the «existence view» of the evaluation in the language and complement each other. In this study, the linguistic structures of assessment were considered in the direction of linguoculturology.

In linguistics, the term linguoculturology began to be used since the 90s of the XX century. Linguoculturology (lat.: lingua-language, cultura-culture, logoscience, doctrine) as a scientific discipline of the synthesis type, characterized by a holistic, balanced and systematic consideration of culture and language.

The theoretical foundations of linguoculturology were studied in depth by such scholars as W. Humboldt, E. Sepir, B. Worf, G. K. Kolshansky, F. I. Buslaev, A. N. Afanasyev, A. A. Potebnya, A. Vezhivitskaya, N. I. Tolstoy, S. E. Nikitina, Yu. S. Stepanov, V. V. Vorobyov, who noted that language is a cultural tool.

According to the hypothesis of E. Sepir and B. Warf, the structure of language and the systemic semantics of its units mature in correspondence with the structure of thinking and the method of cognition of the outside world in certain people.

V. Vorobyov in his study «Linguoculturology: (theory and method)» wrote that «Linguoculturology is a» scientific discipline of the synthesis type», which is characterized, first of all, by a holistic, balanced and systematic consideration of culture and language. It is more important here than a simple study of the interaction of linguistic, ethno-cultural and ethnopsychological factors, but a holistic theoretical-descriptive study of the cultural values reflected in the language,» says Vorobyov [12, 4].

Aspects of linguoculturology in English is studied in the works of K. J. Dunkerley and W. P. Robinson, K. Fox, A. B. Geffer, B. J. Naterop, E. Haberfellner, E. Weiss, H. Roddick.

The image of the world and language, culture are inextricably linked. The category of evaluation is closely related to a person's understanding of the world, that is, the linguistic picture of the world in human consciousness. Evaluation –

the process of categorization of being from the point of view of evaluation and its result [13, 199].

The image of the world is a large – scale image of the world, which represents in the form of concepts the specific features of the world, the essence inherent only to oneself, which lies at the root of a person’s vision, knowledge of the world and is considered the result of all spiritual actions of a person. The concept of «linguistic picture of the world» as a term was first introduced into scientific circulation by the well-known scientist L. Weisgerber. This term originates in the ideas of W. Humboldt and the theory of ethnolinguistics at the end of the XIX century in the sciences of physics, philosophy, logic of L. Wingenstein, G. Hertz, and in the XX century in linguistics A. Ya. Gurevich, Yu. Stepanov, G. Kolshansky, L. Weisgerber, V. Postovalova, Yu. Karaulov.

The conceptual picture of the world (cognitive model) reflects the result of conscious, cognitive actions of a person, reflects our real life, the image of the physical world, etc.

The conceptual picture of the world is organized by the laws of thought.

Concepts expressed in the form of knowledge about the environment are recognized as a conceptual picture of the world. Under the influence of information changes, the conceptual picture of the world is dynamically created and is always updated. In the formation of a conceptual image, figurative, visual, experimental, exploratory, adverbial-conceptual types of thinking are involved. In this regard, the concept of a conceptual picture of the world is richer, broader and more complex than the concept of a linguistic picture of the world. For this purpose, the linguistic picture of the world becomes the first and forms it, as opposed to the conceptual picture of the world, because a person can know the world and himself only through language [14, 140].

The conceptual picture of the world can be shared by different people, because humanity has a common mindset. The conceptual picture of the world is an ideal dynamic formation, the basis of which is created not only by verbal, but also by all sensory, all subject–cognitive reality in a symbolic way.

The language is inextricably linked with the way of life of its people. It depends not only on the history, culture of that country, but also on the way of life, spirituality, achievements in the material sphere. Therefore, language serves not only as a messenger of the mind, it is also a promoter of historical and cultural values. The worldview determines the way of life, consciousness, social, political conditions, level of education, concepts of a person. The distinction of a nation from another nation is traced in its way of thinking, spiritual world, customs, traditions, behavior.

The evaluation of the positive and negative behavior of humanity in comparison with various phenomena of the environment and nature is given

differently by different nations. It depends on the way of life, traditions and worldview of the people. For example, the content of proverbs and sayings in the Kazakh language often aims to convey one thought, and in order to define it, they compare, depict, evaluate, and equate it with another world. Among the proverbs of such content as: «Жұмсақ ағаш құртқа жем, Жуас адам жұртқа жем» (A soft tree is prey for worms, a soft man is prey for everyone.), «Бақа жарығы сүмен, Қатын жарығы ерімен» (The frog is beautiful with the lake, the woman is beautiful with her husband), «Еңбексіз ит жер, бейнетсіз бит жер» (who did not work eats a dog (i.e what gets), who has not experienced pain eats lice) the evaluative vocabulary in the composition of proverbs compares the properties of insects in nature with the properties of humans.

For example, in the proverb «айыр құйрық шаяннан айыр тілді адам жаман», even if a person's tongue is not forked, his negative behavior like stinging, biting and injuring the soul with words is represented by the relatively individual physiological characteristics of the scorpion. In the representation of the Kazakh people, the image of the айдаһар (dragon) as the owner of powerful spiritual strength has been preserved. This is why regular comparisons with the word dragon are used to evaluate various human behaviors.

Descriptive comparisons: айдаһардай айбарлы (furious like a dragon), аждаһадай ашулы, айдаһардай зәрлі (angry like a dragon), айдаһардың жарқыраған жалғыз көзіндеі (like a dragon's single shining eye), аузын ашқан айдаһардай (like a dragon with its mouth open), жеміне ұмтылған аждаһадай (like a dragon looking for its prey).

Comparisons with the image of the dragon, denoting action and movement, such as: айдаһарша аласұру, айдаһардай ышқыну, айдаһардай ысқыру, аждаһадай аранын ашу, айдаһардай арбау, айдаһардай ақыру, айдаһардай ысылдау, are widely used to describe a person who does not find a place for himself, confused and exhausted.

The leech (*сүлік*) appears in the Kazakh legends as a black shiny, sticky, stretching, sucking worm. The leech has moments that can be recognized from the positive and negative sides. Its beautiful, sleek black figure is attractively balanced by its chiseled, toned, slender body. For example: *сүліктей әдемі* (beautiful as a leech), *сүліктей жыт-жылтыр* (shiny as a leech), *сүліктей қара* (black as a leech). And its eye-catching and eye-sucking properties are balanced by an unpleasant side. For example: *сүліктей сору* (suck like a leech), *сүліктей қадалу* (stare like a leech), *сүліктей жабысу* (cling like a leech), *сүліктей тырс-тырс ету* (fumble like a leech).

It is known that the smallest species of insects – louse (бит), is recognized in the minds of people with negative meanings, such as blood-sucking and dirty. Therefore, evaluating the various characteristics of a person, we find the name of

this insect from the composition of constant phrases with a negative meaning. For example: *балақтағы бит басқа шықты, биттей де нәрсе қалған жоқ, битін салды, битін сығып, қанын жалап отыр, биті торғайдай, мойны ырғайдай, т.б.* Other insects are also used in the sense of «to frighten, to terrify», to show a degenerate, ugly appearance.

For example: *ала жылан, аш бақа; көк бақа; тірі жан, тісті бақа; аузын бақадай ашты; тісті бақадай жабысты.*

Also, one of the harmful and poisonous insects – the wasp (*бүйі*), which is found in abundance in the Kazakh steppes, is often used to give a negative evaluation, for example, makes the environment disturbing, noisy, intimidating. Because it is a well-known fact that a person who sees a wasp or is bitten by a wasp is frightened, rebels, panics, inspires fear. The concept, born from this feeling, found a rational combination in the form of a regular phrase when describing the named meanings. For example: *бүйідей тиді, бүйі тигендей қылды.* In a number of countries, the butterfly, which is a symbol of summer fashion, tenderness and beauty, is widely used in Kazakh folklore to convey the meanings of cheerfulness, flight, blind flight. For example: *ақ көбелек, көзсіз көбелек, қан көбелек ойнады, шыр көбелек айналу.* The word «worm» (*құрт*), found in phrases, is often used to express only a negative meaning, i.e. meanings of curse, dissatisfaction, slowness of the disease.

For example: *Көздің құрты. Көздің құртын жеді. Көзінің құртын салып, сұғын қадап отыр. Құлағының құрт етін жеді.*

At the same time, there are many language constructions that compare the character and state of mind of a person with natural phenomena.

For example: an assessment of a person's state of mind: *жауар бұлттай түнеріп, қабағынан қар жауып, борандай бұрқ сарқ етіп, жаңбыр жамай су болу* etc.

Evaluation of human behavior: *жаздай жайдарлы, көктемнің күніндей қырық құбылған, күздей мұңлы, etc.*

Evaluation of human activity: *теңіздей толқу, Сырдың суы балтырынан келмеу, құйындай жүйтқу* etc. As we see from these myths, our people portrayed the good qualities of a person, comparing them with the pleasant qualities of nature, and evaluated the negative and unpleasant qualities, equating them with the ugly qualities of nature. In general, Kazakhs tend to describe the positive and negative aspects of human behavior, comparing it with the good and bad behavior of animals and livestock, which are the source of their life.

In English, the following proverbs and analogies are found in evaluating various behavior of a similar person. Speaking about human behavior in the «good/bad» mode, the following types of evaluative meanings can be distinguished: 1. Good and evil: *Thus to be good one must love those who are evil, among whom*

one must include oneself. In the war between good and evil the major battleground is in the hearts of children and the weapons are the lives of adults. 2. True and untrue: *A truth – teller finds the door closed against him. The liar is not believed when he speaks the truth.* 3. Sadness and joy. *One happiness scatters a thousand sorrows. The error of the moment becomes the sorrow of the whole life.* In this case, proverbs and sayings tell us more about a person's state of mind than about his behavior. We have found idioms that define human behavior: *Worrywart, Armchair critic, Busy body, Know it all, Behind the times, Cheapskate, Slimeball, A party pooper, Set in one's way, Social butterfly, Down to Earth etc.*

The variety of illocutive functions of evaluative opinions the pragmatic nature of the evaluation category, which puts the «human factor» in the first place in the «picture of the world», the pragmatic function of the assessment study is considered in the works of M. Orazov, B. Momynova, G. Khasanov.

In the ranking of significant language structures, phraseology plays an important role. In relation to a person, the thematic series of evaluators is diverse in itself.

Evaluation of a person expressing his behavior:

Types of meanings that express positive and negative qualities of a person include:

- courage, audacity, determination: *шыбын жанын шүберекке түйді;*
 - cruelty, ruthlessness: *сүліктей сорды; сүліктей қадалды; көзіне көк шыбын үймелетті; қарға құзғын, шыбынга шұқытты;*
 - avarice, insatiability, corruption, envy: *битін салды (төкті); жылан жайлап барады;*
 - disrespect, lack of reputation: *сөзін бит шаққандай көрмеді; сона шаққандай құрлы көрмеді; шыбын құрлы көрмеді;*
 - dexterity, ability: *жұмыртқадан жүн қырқады, бит терісінен биялай тоқыды;*
 - hard work: *тірі жан, тісті бақа;*
 - crooked, stubborn, fickle character: *көзсіз көбелек; тісті бақадай жабысты;*
 - the trick: *жыланның аяғын көрген; тасбақаның аузынан шөп алу;*
 - good-natured, cheerful: *ақ көбелек;*
 - unkindness, selfish intentions towards someone: *балақтағы бит басқа шықты; аш кенеше жабысты;*
 - talent, master: *бит тағалады;*
- Appreciate the mood of a person:
- Joy, fear, surprise: *аузын бақадай ашырды (ашты); шыбыны ұшты;*
 - get angry: *битке өкпелеп тоныңды отқа салма;*
- Evaluation of human strength by physique, face shape and age:

– appearance: *көк бақа; биті торғайдай, мойны ырғайдай;*

– power: *инеліктей бұралған; тышқан жұтқан жыландай;*

Human life, habitat:

– poverty, hard life: *сығарға биті жоқ;*

– rich, blessed life: *есек құрты мұрнынан түседі; қой үстіне бозторғай жұмыртқалаған, ақ түйенің қарны жарылған etc.*

Evaluation of the relationship of man with the environment:

– enmity: *ала жылан, аш бақа;*

– hurt someone: *кірпідей жиырылу; жыландай жиырылу;*

– threaten, disturb, scold someone: *құлағының құрт етін жеді; бүйідей тиді; бүйі тигендей қылды.*

Language structures that serve to assess the different character of such a person are also exposed in English. Face only a mother could love. Face that would stop a clock. A man of moods. The life and soul of the party. Neither fish nor flesh. A memory like a sieve. Yes-man and etc.

Words with an evaluation component in the composition of lexical meaning can be divided into three groups: 1) Lexemes with the meaning of evaluation (the price is given from the material-conceptual side): excellent, good, bad; 2) Lexemes with ingherent evaluation connotations (the assessment is complicated and relevant in terms of the semantic structure of the word, carried out when necessary): fox (cunning man), wolf (real predator, brave), etc. 3) Words that have connotations of adderent evaluation (assessment is carried out in the context of factors in various situations): шебер (master), қылмыскер (criminal), айтыскер (participant of poetry competitions), etc.

Conclusions

Thus, evaluation is a mental-verbal activity involving the expression of positive or negative characteristics in relation to a specific object, the process of conceptualization of evaluation and categorization of evaluation. It serves to create a picture of the world. «*The national linguistic image of the world*» is an image of the world in which, despite the commonality of some ideas about the world, each nation is recognizable in its own way by a special tone, largely determined by national cognition; we come to the conclusion that «*the conceptual image of the world*» is a system of knowledge about the world accumulated in human consciousness, having a certain orientation, constantly updated.

We tried to prove by examples from parables and proverbs, idioms that evaluative meaningful structures in the language are used to form a conceptual picture of the world. Evaluation in accordance with the culture, worldview of each nation conveys the knowledge of the people about the image of the world. The language serves as a way of describing and reflecting the worldview, personality of each nation, its experience in mastering the world. The language not only

describes the national experience, but passes it on from generation to generation. By accumulating the characteristic cultural and cognitive characteristics of each nation, the language assimilates reality. That is, language as one of the ways of feeling and perceiving truth brings members of a particular language collective closer together not only linguistically, but also culturally and cognitively.

References

1 **Остин, Дж. Л.** How to Do Things With Words. The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955. – Oxford at the Clarendon press, 1962. –172 p.

2 **Гоббс, Т.** Избранные произведения. В 2 т. – М. : Мысль, 1964. – Т. 1. – С. 287–409.

3 **Локк, Дж.** Элементы натуральной философии. 1698. Сочинения в трех томах: Т. 2.— М. : Мысль, 1985. – 560 с

4 **Кант, И.** Трактаты и письма. – М. : «Наука», 1980, 710 с.

5 **Түсіпбекова, Ғ. А.** Қазіргі қазақ тіліндегі бағалау мағынасы және оның құрылымдық жүйесі : филол. ғыл. канд. дисс... Астана, 2007 ж. – 122 б.

6 **Жақсыбаева, Ф. З.** Газет мәтінінің прагматикалық функциясы / Қазақ тілінде шығатын газет материалдары бойынша: филол. ғыл. канд. дисс... автореф. – Алматы, 2000. – 21 б.

7 **Арутюнова, Н. Д.** Типы значений: Оценка. Событие. Факт. – М., 1988. – 341 с.

8 **Манкеева, Ж.** Қазақ тілін зерттеудің когнитивтік негіздері// Тілтаным. – Алматы, 2001. №4. – 39-43 б.

9 **Момынова, Б.** «Қазақ тіліндегі қоғамдық саяси лексика: әлеуметтік-бағалауыштық сөзжасам». – Алматы : «Қазақ университеті», – 2005. – 139 б.

10 **Ерназарова, З.** Сөйлеу тілі синтаксисінің прагмалингвистика-лық аспектісі. – Алматы, 2001. – 192 б.

11 **Темиргазина, З. К.** Оценочные высказывания в современном русском языке. Дисс...д-ра. филол. наук. – Алматы, 1999. – 287 с.

12 **Воробьев, В.** Лингвокультурология: учебное пособие. [Лингвокультурология: учебник]. [Текст] – М. : Изд-во РУДН, 2006.

13 **Ильина, Н. В.** Структура и функционирование оценочных конструкций в современном английском языке: дисс... канд. филол. наук. – М., 1984. – 199 с.

14 **Жаманбаева, Қ. Ә.** Тіл қолданысының когнитивтік негіздері: эмоция, символ, тілдік сана. – Алматы : Ғылым, 1998. – 140 б.

References

- 1 **Austin, J. L.** How to Do Things With Words. The William James Lectures delivered at Harvard University in 1955. – Oxford at the Clarendon press, 1962. – 172 p.
- 2 **Hobbes, T.** Izbranny'e proizvedeniya. V 2 t. [Selected works. In 2 vols.] [Text] – Moscow, 1964, – Vol. 1. – P. 287–409.
- 3 **Locke, J.** E'lementy` natural`noj filosofii. 1698. Sochineniya v trex tomax: T. 2. [Works in three volumes] [Text] – Moscow, 1985, – Vol. 2. – 560 p.
- 4 **Kant, I.** Traktaty` i pis`ma [Treatises and letters]. – Moscow, 1980, –710 p.
- 5 **Tusupbekova, G. A.** [The meaning of assessment in the modern Kazakh language and its structural system] [Text] – Astana, 2007. – 122 p.
- 6 **Zhaksybayeva, F. Z.** Gazet matinin pragmatikalы`q funkciyasы` / Qazaq tilinde shy`gaty`n gazet materialdary` bojы`nsha [Pragmatic function of the text of the newspaper / on the materials of the newspaper published in the Kazakh language] filol. gy`l. kand. diss... avtoref. [Text] – Almaty, 2000. – 21 p.
- 7 **Arutyunova, N. D.** Tipy` znachenij: Ocenka. Soby`tie. Fakt [Types of language values: Evaluation. The Event. Fact.] [Text] – Moscow, 1988. – 341 p.
- 8 **Mankeeva, Zh.** Qazaq tilin zertteudin kognitivtik negizderi// Tiltany`m. [Cognitive foundations of the study of the Kazakh language// Tiltanym] [Text] – Almaty, 2001. №4 – pp. 39–43.
- 9 **Momynova, B.** Qazaq tilindegi qogamdy`q sayasi leksika: aleumettik-bagalauy`shty`q sozzhasam [«Socio – political vocabulary in the Kazakh language : socio-evaluative word formation». [Text] – Almaty : «Kazakh University», 2000. – 139 p.
- 10 **Yernazarova, Z.** Sojleu tili sintaksisinin pragmalıngvistikalы`q aspektisi. [Pragmalinguistic aspect of the syntax of spoken language] [Text] - Almaty, 2001. – 192 P.
- 11 **Temirgazina, Z. K.** Ochenochny`e vy`skazy`vaniya v sovremennom russskom yazы`ke. Diss...d-ra. filol. nauk. [Evaluative statements in the modern Russian] [Text] – Almaty, 1999. – 287 p.
- 12 **Vorobyev, V.** Lingvokul'turologiya: uchebnoe posobie. [Linguoculturology : textbook]. [Text] – Moscow : Publishing House of the RPFU, 2006
- 13 **Ilyina, N. V.** Struktura i funkcionirovanie osenochnyh struktur v sovremennom anglijskom yazыke [Structure and functioning of evaluative structures in modern English language] [Text] – Moscow, 1984. – 199 p.
- 14 **Zhamanbayeva, K. A.** Til qoldany`sy`ny`n kognitivtik negizderi: e`mociya, simvol, tildik sana. [Cognitive foundations of language use: emotion, symbol, linguistic consciousness]. [Text] – Almaty : Science, 1998. – 140 p.

Accepted for publication on 08.09.23.

*К. Б. Даутбаева¹, К.К. Дүйсекова²

^{1,2}Л. Н. Гумилев атындағы Еуразия ұлттық университеті,

Қазақстан Республикасы, Астана қ.

Басып шығаруға 08.09.23 қабылданды.

ҚАЗАҚ ЖӘНЕ АҒЫЛШЫН ТІЛДЕРІНДЕГІ БАҒАЛАУ МӘНДІ ТІЛДІК ҚҰРЫЛЫМДАРДЫҢ ҰЛТТЫҚ-МӘДЕНИ СИПАТЫ

Мақала қазақ және ағылшын тілдеріндегі бағалау мәнді тілдік құрылымдардың ұлттық мәдени сипатын қарастыруға арналған. Мақалада қазақ және ағылшын тіліндегі бағалау мәнді тілдік құрылымдардың ұлттық дүниетаныммен байланысын ашу мақсатын көздеді. Қазақ және ағылшын тілдеріндегі бағалау мәнді тілдік құрылымдардың (теңеулер мен тұрақты тіркестердің, мақал мәтелдердің) әлемнің концептуалды бейнесін берудегі қызметі талданды. Зерттеудің өзектілігі бағалау мәнді тілдік құрылымдардың қолданысын ұлттық дүниетаныммен сабақтастыра қарастыру арқылы ұлттың рухани мәдениетін, дүниетанымындағы әлемнің концептуалды бейнесін айқындауынан көрінеді.

Қазіргі лингвистикалық еңбектерде бағалауды зерттеудің әртүрлі аспектілері ұсынылған. Бүгінгі тіл білімінде баға, бағалау, бағалаушылық ұғымдары толыққанды зерттелмеген. Әсіресе бағалау категориясының лингвомәдени аспектісі тереңірек қарастыруды қажет ететін мәселелердің бірі. Бұл мақала осы бағыттағы зерттеулерге қосылған үлес болып саналады. Зерттеу нәтижелерін «Лингвомәдениеттану», «Когнитивті лингвистика», «Лингвоаксиология» салалары бойынша зерттеулерде қолдануға болады. Зерттеу нәтижесінде алынған тұжырымдар қазақ және ағылшын тіліндегі бағалаушылық лексиканы лингвомәдени бағытта зерттеуге түрткі болады.

Кілтті сөздер: лингвомәдениеттану, әлемнің концептуалды бейнесі, когнитивті лингвистика, бағалау категориясы, тіл мәдениет, теңеу.

*К. Б. Даутбаева¹, К. К. Дуйсекова²

^{1,2}Евразийский национальный университет имени Л. Н. Гумилева,
Республика Казахстан, г. Астана.

Принято к изданию 08.09.23.

НАЦИОНАЛЬНО-КУЛЬТУРНЫЙ ХАРАКТЕР ОЦЕНОЧНО ЗНАЧИМЫХ ЯЗЫКОВЫХ СТРУКТУР НА КАЗАХСКОМ И АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКАХ

Статья посвящена рассмотрению национально-культурного характера оценочно значимых языковых структур на казахском и английском языках. В данной статье мы нацелены на раскрытие связи оценочно значимых языковых структур на казахском и английском языках с национальным мировоззрением. В статье проанализирована деятельность оценочно значимых языковых структур (сравнений, устойчивых словосочетаний и пословиц) на казахском и английском языках в репрезентации концептуальной картины мира. Актуальность исследования проявляется в определении духовной культуры нации, концептуальной картины мира в ее мировоззрении путем рассмотрения использования оценочных значимых языковых структур в сочетании с национальным мировоззрением.

В современных лингвистических исследованиях представлены различные аспекты изучения оценки. Нельзя сказать, что в современном языкознании проблема оценки и оценивания является одной из наиболее полно изученных. Лингвокультурный аспект категории оценки, в частности, является одной из проблем, требующих изучения. Эта статья считается вкладом в исследования в этой области. Результаты исследования могут быть использованы в исследованиях по областям «Лингвокультурология», «Когнитивная лингвистика», «Лингвоаксиология». Полученные в результате исследования выводы могут послужить толчком к более глубокому изучению оценочной лексики в казахском и английском языках в лингвокультурном направлении.

Ключевые слова: лингвокультурология, концептуальная картина мира, когнитивная лингвистика, категория оценки, язык, культура, сравнение.

Теруге 08.09.2023 ж. жіберілді. Басуға 29.09.2023 ж. қол қойылды.

Электронды баспа

3,32 МБ RAM

Шартты баспа табағы 23,77. Таралымы 300 дана. Бағасы келісім бойынша.

Компьютерде беттеген: А. К. Темиргалинова

Корректорлар: А. Р. Омарова, Д. А. Кожас

Тапсырыс № 4138

Сдано в набор 08.09.2023 г. Подписано в печать 29.09.2023 г.

Электронное издание

3,32 МБ RAM

Усл. печ. л. 23,77. Тираж 300 экз. Цена договорная.

Компьютерная верстка: А. К. Темиргалинова

Корректоры: А. Р. Омарова, Д. А. Кожас

Заказ № 4138

«Toraighyrov University» баспасынан басылып шығарылған

Торайғыров университеті

140008, Павлодар қ., Ломов к., 64, 137 каб.

«Toraighyrov University» баспасы

Торайғыров университеті

140008, Павлодар қ., Ломов к., 64, 137 каб.

67-36-69

e-mail: kereku@tou.edu.kz

www.vestnik.tou.edu.kz