

OKSANA KOVTUN

Actual problems of contrastive grammar in the focus of pragmalinguistics

Актуальные проблемы контрастивной грамматики в фокусе прагмалингвистики

Abstract. The term *contrastive grammar* is still ambiguous. In this paper we trace the unjustified synonymy of terms (confrontative grammar, comparative grammar, contrastive grammar) which lead to controversy among linguists and we attempt to introduce appropriate clarifications to explain the phenomenon. We can state that this linguistic direction is quite new, and its metalanguage is still in the process of development and formation. When studying contrastive grammar in the modern scientific functional-communicative paradigm, the focus of attention is directed to the issues of pragmalinguistics, that is the research, in addition to the actual meanings, of the semantics of linguistic units for designating objects of the environment, also the speech-thinking activity of speakers who use these units and listeners who interpret them; the possible situations of their application; the study of “language in context”; language research, taking into account the goal that is planned to be achieved in the communication process; the wide multidimensionality of the interpretation of the statement; the study of interactive means, taking into account grammatical meanings. The main category of pragmalinguistics is the category of evaluation, and therefore, the issue of contrastive grammar and contrastive description of languages is important to consider in the focus of the paradigm of the category of evaluation; in particular, this concerns the manifestation of each grammatical category.

Keywords: contrastive grammar, term, metalanguage, evaluation grammar, pragmalinguistics

Oksana Kovtun, Vasyly' Stus Donetsk National University, Donetsk – Ukraine, o.kovtun@donnu.edu.ua, ORCID ID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9139-8987>

Introduction

Comparative studies in linguistics have a long history. Comparison is a general scientific method of research, which is used along with logical analysis, generalization, description and other methods. It is traditionally believed that the heyday of comparative linguistics was the XIX century, but the method of comparative or contrastive analysis remains the mainstay in linguistic research in the XX and

XXI centuries, and contrastive grammar has become the main principle of foreign language teaching, so textbooks on this subject are paramount.

Comparison or contrast is a property of abstract human thinking, a way of knowing reality, a differentiation of similar objects and phenomena, so the category of comparison in logic and philosophy belongs to the key epistemological categories. It is the diversity of the world that determines the constant comparison of the human consciousness of different phenomena.

Many things, notions, especially in the mental sphere, in the sphere of traditions and habits of the people and public institutions, can be understood only by comparison, i.e. it is necessary to find in this or that object something different from the object familiar to us to realize that the usual object has some other features, qualities, properties or, conversely, to understand what it lacks, why there are no certain features, qualities, properties, or characteristics (Sternin 59).

Today, we see an increase in the interest of linguists in the problems of the comparative research of languages, which is related to the **needs** of: 1) linguo-cultural and cognitive scientific-research and teaching practices which are increasingly coming to the fore; 2) the actualization of issues related to the national specifics of language thinking, language consciousness, and the mentality of peoples; 3) the identification of universal characteristics of languages; 4) the most complete description of national pictures of the world of speakers of different languages; 5) the representations of national and cultural specifics of language systems; 6) the improvement of bilingual dictionaries, during the compilation of which the task is to reflect the national-specific features of the semantics of translated correspondences; 7) expanding the scope of teaching foreign languages, etc. (Konopel'ko 5).

In modern linguistics, there are many terms for the nomination of a section of linguistics that studies two or more languages based on their comparison and contrast. However, depending on the purpose and object, there are branches of linguistics based on comparison. These are, first of all: a) **comparative-historical linguistics** which studies the genetic commonality of languages in their development; b) **areal linguistics**, which considers the secondary affinity of languages, linguistic unions, and commonality of linguistic phenomena, regardless of the degree of their genetic commonality; c) **comparative and contrastive linguistics**, which study the similarities and differences between languages, regardless of the degree of their genetic similarity, etc. (Ėvtušenko 24).

This diversity is due to the goals, principles and criteria that underlie the selection of a particular field of linguistics, engaged in the comparison and contrast of languages. However, there are different views on the feasibility of terminological distinction between comparative and contrastive linguistics.

Research methods

The main research methods of this investigation are **descriptive**, used for the appropriate consistent representation of the material, as well as the method of **deduction** (to obtain general conclusions) and **induction** (in the formulation of the author's intentions, or opinions), and **analysis** and **synthesis** (for appropriate systematization of theoretical material). The method of **abstraction** was updated during the consideration of various parameters characteristic of the phenomena. **The comparative** method was used for representing the comparison of different views on the problem, and the method of **opposition** was applied to represent the opposition of the categories. **Conceptual-analytical** and **interpretive** methods contributed to the qualification and methodological assessment of updated theoretical provisions, and interpretation of possible approaches to solving the problem.

History of the issue and analysis of recent research and publications

Contrastive linguistics as a science was formed in the middle of the XX century in English-speaking countries. The beginning of contrastive research is considered to be the publication of Robert Lado's monograph *Linguistic across cultures* (Lado), and Charles Bally's research (Bally) who justified the need to teach German in a French-speaking audience.

Researchers believe that the European grammars of the Renaissance – the first grammars of modern languages – were created in comparison with the grammars of Greek or Latin. Obviously, the modern linguist who describes a foreign language or dialect always relies on the usual scheme of vision of mostly native language or sometimes some other language, with which he involuntarily compares the facts of the new language being researched, contextualizing these facts with the usual network of concepts, fixed in his consciousness. Let's recall that **language consciousness** is a form of consciousness that embraces knowledge, feelings, evaluations and guidelines for language and language activities, or language consciousness – it is a “not indifferent attitude to language” (Seligej 13).

The term *contrastive linguistics* was coined by Lee Whorf in *Languages and Logic* (1941). This scientist stressed that contrastive linguistics plays an important role in the process of scientific linguistic research with the actualization of the system of appropriate methods. The linguist stated that contrastive linguistics is a scientific discipline that “outlines the most important differences between languages, which is projected on grammar, logic and general analysis” (Whorf 240). Thus, this linguist somewhat narrowed the vector of action of contrastive linguistics in comparison with comparative linguistics.

In authoritative modern Ukrainian and Russian dictionaries of linguistic terms, the nominations *comparative linguistics*, *typology* and *confrontational linguistics* are given as synonyms of the term *contrastive linguistics* (Ârceva 1990: 239; Zagnitko 2020: 382) and are interpreted in the science in many ways, including as a **linguistic direction** that studies two or more languages to compare their structures and identify differences (contrast/non-contrast) against the background of similarity (Zagnitko 2020: 382). It is an established science with its object, goals and methods of analysis. According to Anatoliy Zagnitko, *comparative linguistics* (*comparative studies*) is a direction (sphere) of linguistics that studies two or more languages, regardless of their affinity, to identify their similarities and differences at all levels of language structure (phonological, morphological, syntactic, lexico-semantic) (Zagnitko 2012: 58). This view is supported by other researchers, noting that contrastive (confrontational, comparative) linguistics is a field of general linguistics, which aims at the comparative study of two (rarely several) languages, identifying their similarities and differences at all levels of language structure (Dubina 176; Ârceva 1981: 40).

Some scholars interpret contrastive linguistics somewhat more narrowly and contrast it with confrontational linguistics. This understanding can be traced in the works of Gustav Helbig, Valery Mokienko, and Vladimir Gak. These linguists are convinced that confrontational (this term corresponds to the Ukrainian “comparative”) linguistics is mostly designed to develop theory issues: it studies both similarities and differences between languages, and contrastive linguistics has a more practical focus and explores mostly the differences between languages (Gak; Hel’big; Mokienko).

Kadriya Gafiullina distinguishes between “comparativistics” and “contrastivistics”, proposing to the latter synonymous contrastive linguistics and comparative linguistics. She emphasizes that the comparison of languages in general linguistics is carried out in two directions: comparative linguistics (“comparativistics”) and contrastive linguistics (“contrastivistics”). The first direction is related to the comparison of related languages mainly in the historical perspective with the definition of the ancestral language, common roots, historical changes in phonetics, grammar and so on. The task of the second direction is the comparative study of several (usually two) languages in a synchronous perspective. Gafiullina notes that “comparative linguistics is a source of ‘contrastivistics’, and contrastive linguistics is more related to linguodidactics” (Gafiullina 135). Comparative linguistics is theoretical in nature, and contrastive linguistics is mainly related to the applied aspect – the translation and teaching of a foreign language. Such views are supported by Alois Gudavičûs (Gudavičûs 4) and Fatima Isenova (Isenova 73).

Shara Mazhitaeva and Zhanar Omasheva state that there is still no consensus among scholars on the interpretation of the terms *comparative linguistics* and *con-*

trastive linguistics (Mažitaeva 72). These researchers consider the terms *comparative* and *contrastive* research as synonymous and emphasize that such research may have different tasks and approaches such as 1) identifying similarities and differences in the use of language tools in different languages; 2) determining the characteristics of each of the languages being compared; 3) predicting unwanted interference. Thus, “the study of language units in terms of comparing their structural, systemic and functional properties remains one of the urgent tasks of modern linguistics” (Mažitaeva 74–76).

Inessa Konopelko distinguishes between linguistic typology, comparative linguistics and contrastive linguistics. She believes that typological research aims to establish common types of world languages, taking into account the different systems of features. Comparative linguistics is a linguistic field designed to study language microsystems (fields) of the same name in different languages. And contrastive research is aimed at comparing units of one language with their possible correspondences in another language to identify potential differences (Konopel'ko 17–19).

The authors of the collective monograph *New Approaches to Contrastive Linguistics* distinguish between historical-comparative, typological and contrastive linguistics, without proposing other terms for the latter. They believe that, in contrast to historical-comparative linguistics, contrastive linguistics has a purely synchronous orientation and does not necessarily have to focus on describing genetic connections (although the historical description may contribute to more adequate contrastive research and allows you to conditionally place languages on a certain **historical line**). Typological linguistics also analyzes the synchronous level, but these two areas focus on different research tasks and are based on different approaches, or methodological principles. “Whereas typology analyzes a few parameters of variation across a wide variety of languages, contrastive linguistics analyzes many different parameters of variation in only two (or three) languages” (Enghels et al. 1–2). Thus, if typological linguistics classifies languages based on a set of described properties (or linguistic universals), then contrastive linguistics is designed to analyze lesser-known or insufficiently described linguistic facts and phenomena. This difference in descriptive detail is mainly because there are many more resources available for the study of contrastive linguistics than for the study of the typological one (Enghels et al. 2).

However, today there are still many problems in the field of contrastive linguistics that are not fully resolved, for example, more languages or language groups should be involved in contrastive research. These studies should be based not only on translated material, but also on the new types of discourses that are being modelled today, not only on written language, but also on oral, live spoken language, taking into account Internet resources, and others (NACL).

Setting objectives

The term *contrastive grammar* is still ambiguous. We trace the unjustified synonymy of terms (confrontative grammar, comparative grammar, contrastive grammar) which lead to controversy among linguists and attempt to introduce appropriate clarifications to neutralize synonymy. To determine the status of contrastive grammar, it seems appropriate to find out its connections with other linguistic directions. There is an urgent need to define and interpret the basic terms of contrastive linguistics in general and contrastive grammar in particular, in order to clarify the state of fixing their metalanguage in linguistic dictionaries and textbooks on contrastive grammar, and to identify and characterize their linguistic directions and development prospects. We see the **novelty** of this scientific intelligence in the statement of involvement in the research aspects of contrastive linguistics, pragmlinguistic theory and axiological theory in particular, taking into account the theory of evaluation grammar.

Presenting the main material

The purpose of contrastive linguistics is to identify the differences and common features of comparable languages, and compare the linguistic and sociocultural data inherent in several languages or individual languages to establish models, categories and features that reflect the specifics of a language, typological and/or universal models, categories and features characteristic of the compared languages. An integral part of contrastive research is the analysis of interlingual correspondence, which provides a better understanding of structural and functional divergence.

The term *contrastive linguistics* in modern linguistics has 1) a special purpose, which is realized during the study of languages – it is a systematic separation of differences, 2) our own method of language learning – from the fact of the native language to the facts of a foreign language, and 3) a kind of practical application in the teaching of foreign languages. All this testifies in favour of recognizing the contrastive direction as a special and independent direction of linguistics. Contrastive linguistics emerges as an established science with its own object, goals and methods of analysis.

The development and values of the contrastive-linguistic direction in linguistics is evidenced by the publication of more and more works, general theoretical descriptions of contrastive linguistics, and comparative descriptions of language pairs covering different levels of language – from phonology to stylistics and text theory, expanding the scope of comparative analysis: at first, contrastive analysis dealt main-

ly with the facts of the language system, but now it is increasingly turning to the text, language acts, and implementation, following the general direction of development of modern linguistics (Gak 16). The era of purely structural-system analysis is almost complete, but the era of the textual and discourse-centered one has come.

Comparative linguistics is based primarily on the need to describe languages in order to teach them. Therefore, modern contrastive linguistics is a kind of sublimation, i.e. a theoretical generalization of the ancient human practice of language description. To make interlingual/intralingual and intercultural/intracultural comparisons in contrastive linguistics, most researchers use the term *contrastive analysis*, although other formulations can be found in the linguistic literature, such as the *parallel description of languages*, *differential language learning*, *differential language description*, *analytical language comparison*, *descriptive comparison of languages*, etc. (Klimčenko 50).

Ke Ping notes that contrastive linguistics is also known as “contrastive analysis” or “contrastive research”. These three terms, as noted, are largely interchangeable. In the United Kingdom and the United States, “contrastive analysis” is a common term. But in Eastern Europe, China and some other parts of the world, the term “contrastive linguistics” is preferred, perhaps because the terms “contrastive analysis” and “contrastive research” may give the impression that they refer only to the approaches to specific linguistic issues, while the term “contrastive linguistics” nominates an independent discipline, so it should be preferred while speaking not about the research process, but about the phenomenon of the research itself (Ping 8).

Eleonora Sulejmenova emphasizes that contrastive linguistics establishes the similarities and the differences of languages that are compared and, therefore, focuses on finding the most effective ways to learn one (or more) languages. In her opinion, absolutely all linguistic phenomena that meet the tasks of an applied nature can be the object of contrastive analysis (Sulejmenova).

The number of languages that can be typologically contrasted at the same time is not limited. Contrastive research can focus on a variety of linguistic phenomena, ranging from individual features of the phonetic/phonological, morphological, lexical or syntactic phenomena of languages (Gladuš 4). This view is reflected in *Encyclopedia of Hebrew Language and Linguistics*, which emphasizes that contrastive grammar studies the synchronous analysis of the similarities and differences between two or more languages (Khan 3). Contrastive research, as noted, is almost always closely linked to the teaching of foreign languages, and their development, and motivated by the experience of learning foreign languages. Every foreign language teacher knows that the native language can interfere in certain, sometimes predictable cases with the acquisition of a second language (Ârceva 1981: 4).

It is well known that Lev Shcherba considered the comparative study of languages to be of great importance not only for the acquisition of a foreign language but also for a better understanding of the peculiarities of the native language and a deeper understanding of its structures (Shcherba). Charles Fries had the same point of view, noting that “the most effective teaching materials are those based on a scientific description of the language being studied, involving comparisons to update the results of a parallel description of the student’s mother tongue” (Fries 9). Such a view can be traced to the authors of one of the popular modern textbooks on contrastive grammar (Meehan et al.). Proponents of this approach believe that contrastive linguistics is a discipline whose goal is to compare two languages to facilitate the study of the language by identifying important differences between native and target languages. Contrastive linguistics studies exactly how (positively or negatively) the identified differences affect the study of the target language. The main purpose of contrastive linguistics is the study of contrastive grammar, which combines the descriptive grammars of two languages in one unique form (Meehan et al. 11). Thus, we trace the gradual expansion of the research aspects of contrastive linguistics, which have been developed over a long period of time.

Observations of the difficulties in mastering certain constructions of a foreign language give rise to clarifying which features of the native and foreign languages do not overlap, and in which area (structural or semantic-functional) their differences lie. Veronika Yartseva emphasizes:

The methodological aspect of “grammar of errors” is outside of linguistics, psycholinguistic aspects of this problem lie on the border of linguistics and psychology and, finally, structural, functional, synonymous differences of constructions that are difficult to learn should attract the attention of linguists (Árceva 1981: 8),

actualizing a new aspect which is called the “contrastive grammar of errors”. Knowledge of several languages (related or unrelated) affects the quality and speed of learning a foreign language by comparison because in this case the comparative analysis is not limited to two languages – target (foreign) and native. We conclude that the intensive development of the phenomena of bilingualism, trilingualism, and polylingualism has, as expected, led to an increase in interest in the issues of comparative linguistics, contrastive linguistics, and linguodidactics (Gafiullina 138).

However, the tasks of contrastive linguistics are not limited to the goals of teaching foreign languages. Contrastive research makes it possible to get to the heart of language processes and better understand the laws that govern these processes. Therefore, contrastive linguistics is a zone, a certain crossroads, where, figuratively speaking, the paths of theory and practice intersect. Grammars of the studied second language and many first grammars of the native language were

written with the involvement of methods of comparison, conscious or unconscious, with another language – the native one in the first case, or the more prestigious language of the other culture – in the second case. Based on the analysis, we see that **the object of contrastive studies is at least a pair of languages**. But neither genetic nor areal connections, nor the typological proximity or remoteness of these languages, are significant in the comparison process. **The subject of contrast may be differences or correspondences of the contrasted languages.**

Contrastive grammar is a direction (component) of contrastive linguistics. Contrastive grammar is aimed at establishing a) common and b) heterogeneous, as well as c) dominant and d) recessive features of the grammatical structure of the languages being compared, and e) determining their structural types on this basis. Iryna Karamysheva considers contrastive grammar as a component of contrastive linguistics (comparative linguistics), and its research object is the grammatical structures of two contrasted languages, features of expression of main grammatical categories and syntactic structures in contrasted languages. The researcher clearly distinguishes between contrastive linguistics and comparative-historical linguistics, typological and areal, although all these independent scientific directions use comparative and contrastive methods of linguistics (Karamysheva 30). Contrastive research pursues not only theoretical but also practical goals. Thus, the theoretical and practical purpose of the contrastive study of two languages, as noted by researchers, is the construction of grammar, the content of which is a description of the sum of differences between the grammar of the native language and the grammar of the language being studied (Ping; Enghels et al.). Thus, **contrastive grammar is a kind of differential grammar**. But this does not mean that grammatical sectors that coincide in two languages should not be studied. Such an approach would inevitably lead to a misinterpretation of the facts of the language being studied. Contrastive grammar uses both contrasting and comparing linguistic phenomena (Ping 4).

The grammatical level of contrastive description most clearly reveals the typological features of the compared languages. Thinking, which has universal laws, is manifested through numerous languages that differ significantly from each other in grammatical structure, in particular in the number and composition of parts of speech, which forms a categorical (partly linguistic) lacunarity. Typological (morphological) features of languages are clearly manifested in the system of parts of speech, and at the same time, the systems of parts of speech are as close as possible, even in unrelated different system languages. This is because languages are inextricably linked with universal categories of thinking, inseparable from universal logical categories (Akaj 166). During contrastive analysis, the inclusion of the analyzed linguistic fact in several phenomena related to it, i.e. with the actualization of certain microsystems, plays an important role. In related, espe-

cially closely related languages, certain semantic and grammatical areas coincide, and differences are determined mainly within the internal division of subsystems with a certain variability of their lexical content. Contrastive grammatical studies largely intersect with typological studies in cases where it is not a comparison of a pair of languages, but a grammatical comparison of a wide range of languages. Their difference from the actual typological research lies in the fact that they do not compare language systems in general, but individual phenomena of many languages of different types.

In addition to the initial range of interests of contrastive linguistics related to language teaching and translation practice, modern contrastive studies develop a wide range of problems of 1) a cognitive and 2) a psycholinguistic orientation. Modern contrastive studies are 3) linguocultural in nature and are designed to answer the question of which aspects of extralinguistic reality are differently verbalized by grammatical and lexical means of different languages. In addition, 4) the comparative study of paraverbal characteristics of communication is actively developing. Contrastive techniques are also used for 5) intralinguistic comparisons. Let us dwell on the studies performed in the field of nonverbal linguistics: they are developed in the context of the globalization of world processes, which is manifested in the field of intercultural communication and comparative linguistics. Tet'iana Osipova, for example, uses a comparative analysis of the paremic fund of related and unrelated languages to identify the national specifics of the process of the **verbalization of nonverbalism**, and in particular 6) a comparative approach to the study of verbal and nonverbal communication in the native language. This is a new direction, developed on the theoretical basis of pragmalinguistics. The named researcher notes that:

mastering a foreign language at the communicative level is first of all mastering the basics of social communication of the respective ethnic group, therefore, the formation of the basic level (B2) of foreign language proficiency should be designed in social communication as one that allows free application of theoretical knowledge. [...] This is realized by complexes of tasks aimed mainly at the formation of speech competence, which is mastering the lexicon of a language, mastering etiquette language norms, studying linguistic culturological material and so on. Instead, such a set of knowledge can not fully ensure the communicative process, because nonverbal communication plays perhaps the most important role in communication in general. Thus, without the interaction of nonverbal activity with verbal, it is impossible to model the communicative system and the actual thought process (Osipova 294).

With the growing number of contrastive studies, they are increasingly associated with *macrolinguistic contrastive analysis*, which includes, in addition to the study of linguistic discourse, *contrastive pragmatics*, in the field of the view of which there are pragmatically oriented aspects of language behaviour (Klimčenko 53). Contrastive linguistics is gaining momentum, the scale and depth of its re-

search are only growing, and the variety of practical and theoretical approaches is impressive. Modern linguistic approaches and the latest technologies have opened up new horizons and directions of contrastive analysis for contrastive linguistics. Thus, it can be stated that contrastive linguistics reflects the fundamental concepts of language that have changed over time, and revised the goals and objectives of the research.

Modern developments in the field of contrastive linguistics are characterized not only by a variety of opinions about their goals and general direction but also by a variety of methods. A large amount of scientific research is aimed at the study of *transformational grammar*, and ideas about deep and surface structures. In the field of comparative research in grammar, there is an ever deeper differentiation of different areas, one of which is the *contrastive study of the grammar of evaluation* (Kovtun 2020a: 275) which separated from the *theory of linguoaxiology* and is partially described on the Ukrainian-language material.

A complete and comprehensive study of lingua-axiological issues in the **East Slavic tradition**, in particular in **Ukrainian linguistics**, was first carried out by Tatiana Kosmeda, which is thoroughly represented in the monographic study *Aksiologični aspekti pragmalinguistiki: formuvannâ i rozvitok kategorii ocinki* (Kosmeda 2000). In the **Russian research tradition**, linguoaxiology is associated primarily with the works of Nina Arutyunova, who was the first to carry out a fundamental conceptual analysis of words with the semantics of evaluation, taking into account the Western European linguistic and philosophical paradigm from a historical perspective (1988). Nadezhda Aksenova (2007), Elena Wolf (2002), Tatiana Markelova (2013), Elvira Stolyarova (1988), Viktor Shakhovskiy (2008) and others became Nina Arutyunova's followers in Russian linguistics.

Grammar of evaluation stood out from the bosom of Ukrainian linguoaxiology, the issues of which were actualized by Kosmeda in the above-mentioned monograph, as well as in several articles, directing the research of her post-graduate students (Yuriy Bulyk, Daria Ryazantseva, Oksana Haliman). To date, the *morphology of evaluation* as a component of the grammar of evaluation has been comprehensively characterized on the material of the Ukrainian language by Oksana Haliman, which is represented in the monograph *Gramatika ocinki: morfologični kategorii ukraïns'koï movi* (Haliman).

We believe that the scientific researches prepared by Kosmeda and Haliman in co-authorship are important for *the theory of grammar of evaluation*, among which we consider *Gramatika ocinki' âk aktual'na problema sučasnoho movoznavstva* the most significant, which explains the concept of the grammar of evaluation as a new scientific field, the purpose of which is a comprehensive study of grammatical means of expressing values taking into account their pragmatic characteristics. It is noted that the development of the theory of grammar of evaluation involves

a comprehensive description of grammatical means of the expression of evaluation values, which will ensure the development of rules for the use of grammatical units in evaluation functions and the interpretation of patterns of their interpretation (Kosmeda, Haliman 21).

The grammatical means of expression of evaluation include both morphological units and syntactic constructions, which traditionally determines the division of grammar of evaluation into two subdivisions: the *morphology of evaluation* and the *syntax of evaluation*, which are inextricably linked because secondary meanings of morphological forms (including evaluation) are realized in syntagmatic relations. Haliman represented the description of the whole system of noun and verb grammatical categories through the prism of evaluation grammar, showing, in particular, the functional load of some stylistic means that create grammatical connotation and play a key role in modelling the relevant speech genres (Haliman). The researcher did not include in the field of view the functional parts of speech and the interjections that need to be studied given the needs of the grammar of evaluation.

In linguistic dictionaries, the term *grammar of evaluation* is not interpreted today, and the metalanguage of this latest linguistic direction has not found a fixation and a comprehensive interpretation. Analyzing *Sučasnij lingvističnij slovník* by Anatolij Zagnitko, we note that *grammar of evaluation* with its metalanguage as the latest linguistic direction interpreted and studied only in the last decade has not found fixation and comprehensive interpretation in this dictionary yet. In particular, the term *evaluation* is interpreted by the named scientist as 1) an aspect of the semantics of linguistic expressions; a reflection of structures of the peculiarities of the division of the objective world by speakers according to its value parameters – *good or evil, benefit or harm, positive or negative*, etc. in language; 2) the speaker's judgment, his attitude – *approval or disapproval, encouragement*, etc. – as part of the stylistic connotation (Zagnitko 2020: 382). However, Kosmeda also considers evaluation as a logical and philosophical category, noting that “the known world is always evaluated, evaluation is evidence of the degree of knowledge of the world” (Kosmeda 2000: 92). Haliman continues this idea, arguing that the “logical and philosophical basis of the evaluation allows us to interpret its connection with the cognitive activity of man, as a result of which the judgment is made about the value of certain objects” (Haliman 20). The researchers emphasize that evaluation is a major category of pragmalinguistics.

In *Sučasnij lingvističnij slovník* by Zagnitko there are also terms *аксіологічний* (*axiological*), *аксіологічність* (*axiological property*) (Zagnitko 2020: 10), to which synonyms *оцінність* (*value*) and *аксіологія* (*axiology*) (Zagnitko 2020: 522) are proposed; the last ones have long been included in the terminological field of lin-

guistics, interpreted and functioning within it and at the intersection with other sciences.

However, meta-units interpreted and declared in grammar of evaluation, namely: *граматика оцінки* (*grammar of evaluation*), *категорія оцінки* (*category of evaluation*), *оцінне значення* (*evaluative value*), *оцінний смисл* (*evaluative meaning*), *аксіологічний смисл* (*axiological meaning*), *граматикалізація оцінних значень* (*grammaticalization of evaluative values*), etc., are still to be included in the linguistic terminology system in general and terminological dictionaries in particular. Some of these terms have already become actively used in linguistic researches (Kovtun 2020b: 143).

In the Western linguistic tradition, there are fragmentary works on linguoaxiology and evaluation grammar (Michael Halliday, James Martin, Peter White, the collective research by James Martin and Peter White, Susan Hunston, Laura Hidalgo Downing), but fundamental monographic studies that would be devoted to the issue of linguoaxiology are absent in contrast to East Slavic linguistics (Kovtun 2020a: 291).

Depending on the methodology of the scientific schools of the Western tradition, axiological linguistics has developed a certainly established metalanguage, but researchers also suggest authorial terms that have not yet become traditional and are not accepted by East Slavic linguistics, in particular: *Appraisal Framework* (Michael Halliday; James Martin and Peter White), *Classematics* (Eugenio Coseriu), *evaluative appreciation* (Horst Geckeler), *the autonomous plane* and *the interactive plane* (John Sinclair), *the interactive evaluation* (Susan Hunston), *topic-oriented evaluation*, and *research-oriented evaluation* (Puleng Thetela), *Field of Research* and *Field of Domain* (Susan Hood), *the language of evaluation* (Monika Bednarek), *a local grammar of evaluation* (Susan Hunston). We can state that most of these terms are not yet recorded in dictionaries of linguistic terms and need to be clarified and developed (Kovtun 2020a: 291).

Conclusions and suggestions

The terminological field of contrastive grammar remains insufficiently developed, and terms and concepts need to be clarified and supplemented. We can state that although this linguistic direction has a long research tradition, its metalanguage continues to develop and improve. We trace the unjustified synonymy of some terms (*comparative grammar*, *confrontational grammar*, *contrastive grammar*), which leads to a certain terminological amorphousness, controversy among linguists and attempts to make appropriate clarifications to neutralize synonymy.

Having considered the system of terms that function in 1) the professional discourse of textbooks on contrastive grammar, 2) scientific research on it, as well as comparative linguistics, and 3) terminological dictionaries, we consider it appropriate to consider the terms *contrastive grammar*, *comparative grammar* and *confrontational grammar* as synonymous; however, of course, they are not absolutely identical, as each member of the synonymous series differs by corresponding features, in particular, the belonging of terms to specifically Ukrainian (*contrastive grammar*, *comparative grammar*) and those that are borrowed (*confrontational grammar*) is also important.

The term *contrastive grammar* seems to most accurately reflect the essence of the educational goal – the comparison of descriptive grammars of several languages, and the opposition and the comparison of allomorphic features. In addition, this term “sounds” the same in all three languages (Ukrainian, Russian and English), on the material of which the actual contrast analysis is carried out.

In modern research, contrastive analysis increasingly refers to the text, language acts, and different types of discourse, following the general vector of development of modern linguistics. Given the polyparadigmatic nature of modern linguistics, the actualization of the principle of interdisciplinary, contrastive analysis, includes various research aspects: ethnolinguistic, sociolinguistic, psycholinguistic, linguosemiotic, linguopragmatic, linguaaxiological and others. At the same time, it provides increasingly broad and valuable data for general typology within the theory of general linguistics, as well as linguistic pedagogy, translation theory, text theory, discourse theory, and lexicography. Contrastive linguistics proves to be one of the most striking and effective forms of communication between fundamental linguistics and applied aspects of linguistics. The value of contrastive linguistics in modern linguistics is emphasized by the increasing attention to it in different countries, especially in the field of foreign language teaching.

The cognitive-creative process of establishing similarities and differences between objects of the environment is associated with other tasks of lingua-creative and thought-making human activity – communicative, pragmatic, and aesthetic, because comparison is not only the process of defining something, assertion or denial but also finding the indefinite, i.e. the designation of the phenomenon with not fully clarified parameters. The pragmatics of cognitive and speech activity of a linguoperson encourages the solution of specific tasks – to single out, identify the object, so that it acquires a certain delineation, and this will allow continuing its knowledge, in particular in the focus of the category of evaluation.

The direction of the *contrastive grammar of evaluation* is undoubtedly promising, as the study of the grammar of evaluation can be carried out based on Slavic and non-Slavic languages, which is extremely important for the development of theoretical foreign language courses (including English), the theory and practice

of translation studies, and foreign language teaching methods. Its development will help solve important linguistic problems and problems of methods of teaching linguistic disciplines.

In our further research, we consider it expedient to conduct contrastive studies of the grammar of evaluation based on Ukrainian, Russian and English, as this will make it possible to compare Ukrainian with related Russian and unrelated English as the language of another family, which will help deepen knowledge about the native language, its cultural, lexical, semantic and grammatical features, its originality, and will clarify and supplement the metalanguage of the grammar of evaluation which is projected not only on the material of the Ukrainian language, its discursive practice, but also Russian and English, which is considered an urgent need of modern comparative linguistics.

Bibliography

- Akaj, Oksana. *Fenomen grammatičeskoj lakunarnosti: kognitivnyj i lingvopragmatičeskij aspekti*. Rostov-na-Donu, Rostovskij gosudarstvennyj èkonomičeskij universitet, 2020.
- Ârceva, Veronika. *Kontrastivnaâ grammatika*. Moskva, Nauka, 1981.
- Ârceva, Veronika, red. *Lingvističeskij ènciklopedičeskij slovar'*. Moskva, Sovetskaâ ènciklopediâ, 1990.
- Bally, Charles. *Traité de stylistique Française*. Paris, C. Klincksiek, 1951.
- Dubina, Lûdmila, Tat'âna Rylo. "Sovremennye issledovaniâ v oblasti kontrastivnoj lingvistiky". *Kartina mira čerez prizmu kitajskoj i belorusskoj kul'tur: sbornik statej meždunarodnoj naučno-praktičeskoj konferencii*. Red. M. Miškevič et al. Minsk, Izdatel'skij centr Belarusskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 2019, p. 176–179.
- Engels, Renata, Bart Defrancq, Marlies Jansegers, eds. *New approaches to contrastive linguistics. Empirical and methodological challenges*. Berlin–Boston, De Gruyter Mouton, 2020.
- Èvtušenko, Natalâ. "Kontrastivnij ta zistavnij aspekti doslidžen' u sučasnij lingvističnij nauci". *Naukovî pracî Čornomors'kogo deržavnogo universitetu imeni Petra Mogili kompleksu "Kiëvo-Mogilâns'ka akademiâ"*. Seriâ: *Filologîâ. Movoznavstvo*, 221 (209), 2014, p. 24–28.
- Fries, Charles. *Teaching and learning English as a foreign language*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1945.
- Gafullina, Kadriâ. "Sopostavitel'noe âzykoznanie, kontrastivnaâ lingvistika i lingvodidaktika". *Gumanitarnye nauki*, 12, 2020, p. 135–138.
- Gak, Vladimir. *O kontrastivnoj lingvistike. Novoe v zarubežnoj lingvistike*. Moskva, Progress, 1989.
- Gladuš, Nadiâ, Nataliâ Pavlûk. *Contrastive grammar: Theory and practice*. Kiïv, Kiïvs'kij universitet im. B. Grinčenka – Nacional'nyj universitet Kiëvo-Mogilâns'ka akademiâ, 2019.
- Gudavičûs, Aloizas. *Sopostavitel'naâ semasiologîâ litovskogo i russkogo âzykov*. Vil'nûs, Mokslas, 1985.
- Haliman, Oksana. *Gramatika ocinki: morfologičnî kategorii ukraïns'koï movi: monografiâ*. Harkiv, Majdan, 2019.
- Hel'big, Gerhard. "Âzykoznanie – sopostavlenie – prepodavanie inostrannyh âzykov". *Novoe v zarubežnoj lingvistike*. Vyp. 25. *Kontrastivnaâ lingvistika*. Per. s nemeckogo N. Vasil'eva. Moskva, Progress, 1989, p. 307–326.

- Isenova, Fatima. "Sopostavitel'noe âzykoznanie i kontrastivnaâ lingvistika v sovremennoj âzykovoï paradigme". *Vestnik Karagandskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Seriâ filologiçeskaâ*, 1, 2007, p. 71–77.
- Karamysheva, Irina. *Contrastive grammar of English and Ukrainian languages: Textbook*. Vinnytsia, Nova Knyha Publishers, 2012.
- Khan, Geoffrey. *Encyclopedia of Hebrew language and linguistics*. Leiden, Brill, 2013.
- Klimčenko, Svetlana. "Kontrastivnye issledovaniâ v kontekste sopostavitel'nogo âzykoznaniiâ". *Lingvistika, lingvodidaktika, lingvokul'turologiâ: aktual'nye voprosy i perspektivy razvitiâ*. Red. O. Prohorenko. Minsk, Izdatel'skij centr Belarusskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta, 2018, p. 49–54.
- Konopel'ko, Irina. *Sopostavitel'nyj analiz v issledovanii i prepodavanii âzyka*. Voronež, Izdatel'stvo OOO «RITM», 2019.
- Kosmeda, Tetâna. *Aksiologiçni aspekti pragmalingvistiki: formuvannâ i rozvitok kategorii ocinki: monografiâ*. L'viv, L'vivs'kij nacional'nyj universitet im. Î. Franka, 2000.
- Kosmeda, Tetâna, Oksana Haliman. "«Hramatyka ocinki» âk aktual'na problema sučasnoho movoznavstva". *Lingvistiçni studii*, 22, 2011, p. 17–23.
- Kovtun, Oksana. "Problematika lingvoaksiologii v zahidnij doslidnic'kij tradicii: aspektual'nij oglâd". *Challenges and achievements of European countries in the area of philological researches: Collective monograph*. Vol. 1. Ed. Michele Bugliesi, Ivan Zymomyra. Riga, Baltija Publishing, 2020a, p. 274–297.
- Kovtun, Oksana. "Vidobrazennâ procesu stanovlennâ metamovi gramatiki ocinki v sučasnih slovnikah lingvistiçnih terminiv (na materialî novogo slovnika lingvistiçnih terminiv A. Zagnitka)". *Filologiçni nauki na perehrestî kul'tur i civilizacij: aktual'ni pitannâ*. Red. Volodimir Kazarin. Kiïv, Tavrijs'kij nacional'nyj universitet imeni V.Î. Vernads'kogo, 2020b, p. 141–144.
- Lado, Robert. *Linguistics across cultures: Applied linguistics for language teachers*. Ann Arbor, University of Michigan Press, 1957.
- Mažitaeva, Šara, Žanar Omaševa. "K voprosu o sopostavitel'nyh i kontrastivnyh issledovaniâh v sovremennoj lingvistike". *Izvestiâ. Seriâ: Filologiçeskie nauki*, 61 (2), 2021, p. 71–76.
- Meehan, Patricia et al. *Contrastive grammar: A theory and practice handbook*. Córdoba, Asociación Cooperadora Facultad de Lenguas – Universidad Nacional de Córdoba, 2017.
- Mokienko, Vladimir. "Sopostavlenie v teorii i praktike prepodavaniâ russkogo âzyka kak inostrannogo". *Russkij âzyk za rubežom*, 5, 1987, p. 54–60.
- Osipova, Tetâna. *Neverbal'na komunikaciâ ta svoëridnist' iï omovlennâ v ukraiïns'komu diskursi: fenomen verbalizacii neverbaliki*. Harkiv, Vydavnytstvo Ivančenko Î.S., 2019.
- Ping, Ke. *Contrastive linguistics*. Peking, Peking University Press – Singapore, Springer, 2019.
- Seligej, Pilip. *Movna svidomist': struktura, tipologiâ, viovannâ*. Kiïv, Vydavnyçij dim "Kiëvo-Mogilâns'ka akademiâ", 2012.
- Sternin, Iosif, Marina Sternina. "Aktual'nye problemy sopostavitel'nyh issledovanij v sovremennoj lingvistike". *Social'nye i gumanitarnye znaniâ*, 1, 2015, p. 59–65.
- Sulejmenova, Èleonora. *Kazahskij i russkij âzyki: osnovy kontrastivnoj lingvistiki*. Almaty, Demeu, 1996.
- Whorf, Benjamin L. *Language, thought and reality*. Cambridge, Mass., MIT Press, 1967.
- Zagnitko, Anatolij. *Slovník sučasnoï lingvistiki: ponâttâ i termini*. T. 2. Donec'k, Donnu, 2012.
- Zagnitko, Anatolij. *Sučasnij lingvistiçnij slovník*. Vinnyçâ, TVORI, 2020.