

Interpretation of the Concept of Evaluation by Chinese Linguists

IRGASHEVA UMIDA ASKARDJON KIZI

Uzbek State University of World Languages, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT

The concept of evaluation in the field of linguistics can vary among different linguistic traditions and cultures, including Chinese linguistics. Chinese linguists have their own interpretations and approaches to the concept of evaluation, which are influenced by the unique linguistic and cultural characteristics of the Chinese language. In Chinese linguistics, evaluation often involves the assessment of language or linguistic phenomena based on various criteria. One important aspect of evaluation is the study of linguistic norms and standards. Chinese linguists analyze language usage and determine what is considered correct or appropriate within the framework of the Chinese language. This includes examining grammar, vocabulary, pronunciation, and other linguistic features to evaluate their conformity to established norms. This article examines exactly how the evaluation work by Chinese linguists was studied, the specific opinions of scientists.

Keywords: Evaluation questions, semantic function, cognitive function, pragmatics, description, general assessment, rational assessment, emotional assessment, value assessment, conceptual meaning.

INTRODUCTION

Evaluation is a fundamental aspect of language and communication, playing a crucial role in expressing opinions, attitudes, and judgments. The concept of evaluation has been

extensively explored by linguists worldwide, including those in China. Chinese linguists have made significant contributions to understanding and interpreting evaluation within the context of language and communication. This article aims to delve into the interpretation of the concept of evaluation by Chinese linguists, highlighting their perspectives, frameworks, and methodologies.

THEORETICAL BASIS

To gain insights into the interpretation of the concept of evaluation by Chinese linguists, a comprehensive review of relevant literature, research papers, and scholarly works published by Chinese linguists was conducted. The findings were analyzed to identify common themes, theories, and approaches utilized by Chinese linguists in their interpretation of evaluation.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The 90s of the twentieth century - until the end of the year, Chinese linguists, in particular, 华劭 (Hua Shao), 刘戈 (Liu Ge) (1998, 1999, 2000), 王辛夷 (Wang Xinyi) (1999), 王立刚 (Wang Ligang) (2004, 2007), 杨家胜 (Yang Jiasheng) (2001, 2002, 2010), 陈国亭 (Chen Guoting), 兰巧玲 (Lan Qiaolin) (2004), 高春雨 (Gao Chunyu) (2005), 杨利芳 (Yang Lifang) (2008, 2011), 金城 (Jin Cheng) (2009), 乔兰菊 (Qiao Lanjiu) (2011) and others are dedicated to research assessment in the framework of the Russian language. Most of the research they conducted in brogan was based on the research of Russian scientists E. Wolf and N. Arutyunova on evaluation issues. However, the research of Chinese scientists was also influenced by Russian linguistic theories, such as the school of semantic function, the school of cognitive function and pragmatics. This not only contributed to the study of the evaluation of the Russian language, but also served as a starting point for the study of the Chinese evaluation language. Chinese linguists have separately studied the relationship between evaluation and description. The relationship between evaluation and description has been at the

center of the study of evaluation theory for many years. 刘戈 (Liu Ge) wrote in 1998 the book "Evaluation and description: evaluation from the point of view of words". In his work "Foreign Language Research" from the point of view of vocabulary, using the example of Russian adjectives, for the first time in China, he more objectively and clearly showed the relationship between evaluation and description: "evaluation and description are properties of an object, and strengthening one attribute within the same object often means weakening another attribute. In most cases, evaluative and descriptive factors are interrelated and influence each other." 刘戈 (Liu Ge) Lu explained in more detail the causal relationship between descriptive qualities, general evaluative qualities and partial evaluative qualities based on the classification of predicates proposed by Russian scientists: "the overall assessment is often based on several groups of partial assessments, and the partial assessment is based on the descriptive properties of the object, which manifests itself in a causal sequence: descriptive properties → partial assessment → general assessment. In this sequence, evaluative factors (emotional factors) showed an upward trend, while descriptive factors (objectivity factors) showed a downward trend" [1].

Based on his views, 杨家胜 (Yang Jiasheng) analyzed the content and essential characteristics of the assessment in terms of the meaning of the assessment at the lexical level. In his article, he suggested that the meaning of evaluation was a kind of subjective meaning, and then analyzed the relevant terms such as evaluation and descriptive meaning, general evaluation and specific evaluation, rational evaluation and emotional evaluation, separation of value evaluation and evaluation without value, as well as emotion, expression and expressiveness, thus more explaining in detail the nature of the evaluation value [2].

王立刚 (Van Ligan) considered the types of assessments and their interrelation and analyzed 9 ways to combine the estimated values of two parts of a comparable complex sentence in modern Russian. Different types of comparable complex sentences have neutral evaluative values, assimilated or alienated and positive or

negative evaluations also differ. 王立刚(Van Ligan) discusses the complex and diverse relationship between the definition of the value of evaluation from the point of view of humanism and the type of subject of evaluation. The definition of the evaluation value in the article of a grammatical structure with a complex semantic structure was carried out by the author (as the subject of evaluation) [3].

Having studied the approximate meaning of adjectives of the Russian language, 高春雨 (Gao Chunyu) found that a pure emotional assessment is always higher than all other assessments [4].

杨利芳 (Yang Lifan) discussed the semantic categorization of the general assessment from the point of view of categorization of cognitive linguistics and believed that the meaning of the general assessment in modern Russian does not reflect the basics of assessment, does not explain the essence of the object being evaluated and has no descriptive part. He suggested that the semantic categorization of the overall assessment can be described in terms of recognition/denial of the value of the object, subjective and objective differences in assessment and differences in parameters [5].

王辛夷 (Wang Xinyi), 兰巧玲 (Lan Chiaolin) revealed the pragmatic properties and functions of general evaluative sentences and specific evaluative sentences depending on adjectives as typical evaluative predicates (emotional evaluative sentences, sublimative evaluative sentences and purely rational evaluative sentences, sentences) [6].

金城 (Jincheng) believes that the purpose of evaluation statements is not only to convey the meaning of the assessment “good or bad”, but also to achieve a certain tone, expressing their attitude, which leads to effective results of the recipient. Evaluation statements often use indirect verbal behavior, such as requests, suggestions, warnings, and questions. An evaluation relation is a type of dynamic operation that a speaker performs to realize his or her speech potential, claiming that it can correct the truth and accuracy of the evaluation content and accurately express the intent of sentences [7].

Scientists from the academic community who study English in Chinese linguistics regularly introduce the theory of assessments, which supports the academic status of the theory of the European assessment system. In particular, Ma Weilin (马伟林) believed that “as a developing theory, the evaluation system should be improved”. Many scientists conducted research on the evaluation theory of Martin, a European scientist, and in some aspects were dissatisfied with Martin's opinion, clearly pointing out his achievements and shortcomings. For the first time, Wang Zhenhua (王振华) wondered about this question: is there a phenomenon of evaluation in a small layer of sentences, in a layer of speech and in various genres of articles? [8] Li Chjanzi (李战子) suggested that there is an application of evaluation theory to sentence analysis: further understanding of the “interpersonal nature” of relationships, a combination of evaluation methods and contextual interpretations, separation of interpersonal meaning and conceptual meaning of evaluation, the study of the relationship between evaluation and language in the process of research [9]. Liu Shichju (刘世铸) and Han Jinlong (韩金龙) believe that the theoretical foundations of evaluation in Martin's views are imperfect and that the theories he cites do not discuss evaluation criteria [10]. Chjan Delu (张德禄) and Liu Shiju (刘世铸) believe that Martin's valuation theory includes a complete description of the social symbolic system, but it still lacks formal categorization and corresponding semantic categories [11]. Chju Yongsheng (朱永生) believes that the limitations of evaluation theory manifest themselves in at least two aspects: firstly, evaluation is mainly studied from an interpersonal point of view, and other points of view, such as conceptual, do not receive sufficient attention; secondly, the focus is on a specific assessment, which Martin calls “written” evaluation, and discussion of implicit evaluation, which he calls “awakened” evaluation is not enough. However, the combination of vocabulary and grammar helps to comprehensively and deeply reflect the meaning of the assessment [12].

Evaluation theory researchers such as Martin rarely focus on important evaluation attributes, so fundamental concepts such as

the nature of evaluation remain a problem when studying the evaluation of language material. Li Fagen (李发根) believes that the identification method, its function and four evaluation parameters are important for explaining important evaluation characteristics using examples in English and Chinese. Conceptually, “comparison, subjectivity and social value”, identification, evaluation elements and linguistic vocabulary, grammar, expression of author's opinions, establishment and maintenance of relations between the speaker and the recipient, as well as the organization of communication, good and bad (positive or negative), inevitability, expectation and importance (relevance) of evaluation are the main functions [13]. Liu Shizhu (刘世铸) Discussion of important evaluation characteristics from a linguistic point of view is based on the results of valiology and psychology studies. He believes that evaluation is a complex process of understanding. It is an organism in which the subject, object, value assessment and evaluation criteria interact with each other, that is, the author/speaker as the subject of evaluation and the proposal as the object of evaluation or a person discuss interpersonal values such as emotions, thoughts, attitudes or situations in a position [14].

In his research, Liu Shiju (刘世铸) cited key changes in the evaluation system. He abolished Martin's three-point system of views, considering value as an aesthetic category of judgment subordinate to judgment, and divided the system of views into emotions and judgments, the subsystems of feelings and judgments were recently classified, and judgment was subjective and objective [15].

Regarding the mixed system, Wan Jenhua (王振华) has created a new mixed framework based on psychology, sociology and semantic theory. He considers the subcategories proposed by Martin as “single-voiced” and “multi-voiced”, and divided the mixed subsystem into “three voices”: the first voice refers to how the speaker projects his thoughts or thoughts, the second voice refers to how the speaker expresses his thoughts from the second or third person, and the third voice refers to the speaker's thoughts accepted by the community in which he is located is a

complex. As for gradation, Zhang Yan (张澹) further classifies the system of gradations of academic speech by meaning and form, and believes that the sources of gradation help to create a mechanism for rhetorical persuasion of academic speech [16].

Guan Shuhun and Wan Yali (管淑红,王雅丽) studied the phonological layer by analyzing interpersonal power relations in Roman speech, mentioned the pronunciation features of the characters and the approximate meaning of intonation [17]. Zhao Wei and Li Nan(赵卫, 李南) tried to classify a special element of poetic speech - the phonological system - as evaluative resources, and together with the masterpieces of English poetry confirmed this. As for the implementation of the evaluation value in speech, there are also important points that should be taken into account [18]. Chang Chengguang (常晨光) argued that understanding the meaning of evaluation is rhythmic and has certain cumulative characteristics. The research of all the above-mentioned scientists went beyond the vocabulary and confirmed the reliability and expediency of using vocabulary and other linguistic means in phonology, syntax and sentence structure [19]. Yu Zhangya and Xu Wenhui (余樟亚, 胡文辉) analyzed the corresponding characteristics of the “meaning of the charter” and “meaning of the conversation” in an implicit assessment from a pragmatic point of view [20].

It is important to note that the concept of evaluation in Chinese linguistics is not limited to the linguistic structure itself, but also extends to the cultural, social, and historical contexts in which language is used. Chinese linguists consider language as an integral part of culture and society, and they evaluate linguistic phenomena within this broader framework.

Overall, the interpretation of the concept of evaluation by Chinese linguists involves the assessment of language based on linguistic norms, aesthetic qualities, cultural significance, and historical context. It reflects the multifaceted nature of language and the recognition that language evaluation is not solely based on structural analysis, but also takes into account broader cultural and social factors.

CONCLUSION

Chinese linguists have made notable contributions to the interpretation of the concept of evaluation. Through linguistic analysis, discourse studies, pragmatics, cultural perspectives, cognitive linguistics, conceptual metaphors, corpus linguistics, and computational approaches, Chinese linguists have deepened our understanding of evaluation in language and communication. Their interdisciplinary and multifaceted approaches have enriched the field of linguistics and paved the way for further research in evaluation theory. By acknowledging the contributions of Chinese linguists, we gain a broader perspective on the complexities and nuances of evaluation as a linguistic phenomenon.

REFERENCES

1. Liu Ge. The pragmatic view of "evaluation behavior". *Teaching Russian in China*, 2012. (76).
2. Yang Jiasheng. Evaluation significance from the perspective of linguistics. *Journal of Foreign Languages*, 2002. (18).
3. Wang Ligang. The types of evaluation meanings and their interrelationships. *Journal of the People's Liberation Army Institute of Foreign Languages*, 2004. (83).
4. 高春雨. 俄语形容词的评价意义. *齐齐哈尔大学学报*, 2005. (71).
5. 杨利芳. 现代俄语中一般评价的语义范畴化. *解放军外国语学院学报*, 2011. (53).
6. 兰巧玲. 现代俄语中的评价与评价句. *黑龙江大学硕士研究生学位论文*, 2003. (61).
7. 金城. 评价语句的言语行为分析. *外语学刊*, 2009. (47).
8. 王振华. 评价系统及其运作——系统功能语言学的新发展. *外国语*, 2001. (19).
9. 李战子. 评价理论: 在话语分析中的应用和问题. *外语研究*, 2004. (136).
10. 刘世铸, 韩金龙. 新闻话语的评价系统. *外语电化教学*, 2004. (216).
11. 张德禄, 刘世铸. 形式与意义的范畴化——兼评《评价语言: 英语的评价系统》. *外语教学与研究*, 2006. (426).

12. 朱永生.概念意义中的隐性评价. 外语教学, 2009. (413).
13. 李发根.评价的识别、功能和参数. 外语与外语教学, 2006.(36).
14. 刘世铸.评价的语言学特征.山东外语教学, 2007. (12).
15. 刘世铸.态度的结构潜势. 山东大学博士论文, 2006. (78-79).
16. 王振华.介入: 言语互动中的一种评价视角.
河南大学博士学位论文, 2003. (85-87);
张滢.学术话语中的级差范畴化及其修辞劝说构建.外国语, 2008.
(47).
17. 管淑红,
王雅丽.小说话语的人际意义: 试析“Blackmail”中人物的权势
关系外语与外语教学, 2006. (97-98).
18. 赵卫,李南.诗歌解读的评价视角. 山东社会科学,2012. (68).
19. 常晨光. 作为评价手段的情态附加语探析.外语与外语教学;
2008. (231-234).
20. 余樟亚、胡文辉.隐性评价的“规约含义”与“会话含义”比较.
外语学刊, 2015. (142).

IRGASHEVA UMIDA ASKARDJON KIZI

LECTURER,

DEPARTMENTS OF THEORY AND

PRACTICE OF CHINESE LANGUAGE,

UZBEK STATE UNIVERSITY OF WORLD LANGUAGES,

TASHKENT, UZBEKISTAN.

E-MAIL: <UMIDA.0402@MAIL.RU>