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Abstract
Despite the fact that axiological interpretation of the linguistic and logical categories of evaluation, the problems of the value picture of the world and values, as well as the interpretation of appraisal, are rather widely represented in the works of modern Russian and foreign scientists, the problem of evaluation today has been more developed in the lexical system of the language than in phraseological corpus, that also explains our interest to the representation of the evaluation category in the units of secondary nomination. The main aim of this work is to study the evaluative component in the meaning of verbal phraseological units, describing human behavior in English, Russian and Tatar languages. Phraseological units denoting human behavior are one of the most active formation of the phraseological structure of any language. This group of phraseological units takes a significant place in phraseological system of Russian, English and Tatar languages as well, is characterized by semantic and structural diversity and expresses specific appraisal of the world and a person in it. The authors take an attempt to study evaluation as one of the macro components of the connotation of phraseological meaning of the researched units, suggest their own scale of emotive marks, separately consider the interaction of evaluation with expressiveness, emotiveness.

Keywords: Evaluative Component; Stereotypes; Verbal Idiomatic Phrases; Dictionary Marks; Semes.

1. Introduction
Although the linguistic science is developing, the questions of semantics and pragmatics correlation and interdependence are still to be investigated. At this stage
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of the development of linguistic science, when the problem of the correlation and interaction of semantics and pragmatics has come to the fore, the study of the value-based approach seems especially relevant. The notion of evaluative approach has been already studied from various angles, which, above all, points out its high theoretical and practical significance among the number of other concepts that linguistics and related sciences deal with.

Value-based approach to the surrounding reality and to the perspectives of societal development forms the system of human knowledge regarding the aspects of the past and present daily life and the perspectives of our future development. To evaluate, to assess and to analyze means to cognize and to reflect the existing unsaid knowledge.

Inevitably evaluating the phenomena and the facts of reality, people express their attitudes with the help of the language, which, being the most important means of communication, expresses all possible estimates. Therefore, when studying the structure of a language and its features, it is necessary to thoroughly study the features of the vocabulary, and the phraseological corpus, in particular, as it conveys a variety of methods and types of evaluation. To be able to evaluate and to analyze means to be emotionally intelligent, which is quite essential from the point of view of effective communication.

Evaluative component of connotation still requires detailed study because it is associated with a number of ideological, social, psychological, situational-speech aspects (Avratin, 1992; Bahreman, 2015).

The axiological interpretation of the linguistic and logical categories of evaluation, the problems of the value picture of the world and values, as well as the interpretation of appraisal, are rather widely represented in the works of such scientists as N.D. Arutyunova, V.N. Telia, E.M. Wolf, L.M. Vasilyev, A.A. Ivin, L.A. Sergeeva, S.G. Sheydaeva, N.A. Lukyanova, T.V. Markelova, A.I. Prikhodko, T.V. Pisanova, I.N. Khudyakov, T.N. Persikova, A.P. Sadokhin, V.A. Vasilenko, Z.A. Safiullina, A. Wierzbicka, Ch.L. Stevenson, B. Hernstein Smith, R.M. Hare, etc. Active research is conducted in the system of phraseological units.

Phraseological corpus of the language represents an exceptional knowledge in the form of ‘additional information about the nature of actions and human behavior’ (Atyomova, 1991). Phraseology is a part of linguistic fund, which, in addition to its national identity, is characterized by the breadth of interlingual links (Diaz et al., 2018). Multilingual comparative phraseology has a considerable potential, as it expands the scope of such observations, allowing to compare the languages, in terms of both the national specifics of its phraseology and the degree of interlanguage relations (Davletbayeva et al., 2016). A comparative analysis of the evaluation of phraseological units makes it possible to compare and correlate fragments of phraseological worldviews of different peoples. The importance of the analysis of the phraseological units, denoting human behavior shouldn’t be
underestimated, as E. Sepir pointed out that social behavior represents “a combination or rather well-ordered variety of such kind of sides of individual behavior that are connected with the cultural norms built-in its own context” (Sepir, 2001).

2. Methods

The choice of methods of linguistic analysis used by the authors is determined by the tasks of the paper and the specifics of the material being studied. In the course of the study, we applied such methods as the method of generalization and systematization, the method of descriptive and comparative analysis, the method of component and contextual analysis, the method of etymological analysis, semantic field acceptance, modal frame acceptance, quantitative statistical method. Besides, we analyzed the idioms depicting human behavior with the help of monolingual, bilingual and multilingual dictionaries of phraseological units (Phraseological Dictionary by A.I. Molotkov, Russian-English Phraseological Dictionary by E.F. Arsentieva, English-Russian Phraseological Dictionary by A.V. Kunin, Oxford Dictionary of English Idioms, The Penguin Dictionary of English Idioms, Cambridge International Dictionary of Idioms) and some other lexicographical sources in English, Russian and Tatar languages.

3. Results and Discussion

Modern science approaches the problem of emotions from different angles. Thus, R. Briner believes (1999) that emotions tend to be rather specific reactions to particular events that are relatively intense and short term. This would include, for example, feelings such as guilt, envy, surprise, excitement, rage or resentment» (Briner, 1999).

The category of evaluation is usually represented in the form of an opinion, a kind of judgement about the positive or negative aspects of the person’s character or some object, phenomenon or action (Aydarova & Aminova, 2016). Among the characteristic features of this category are its stability and consistency.

Emotions, their classifications have been of interest of many researchers, the majority of whom recognize three basic types: positive, negative, indifferent or neutral ones. It is important to mention that a human rarely experience the so called pure emotions which can complicate the emotivity of any language means, and the emotivity of verbal idiomatic units in particular. Emotions related to the human physiology enter the language in the form of positive and negative emotions. However, it is quite disappointing to recognize that there is no universally accepted or recognized classification of dictionary marks.

If some Russian language phraseological dictionaries (monolingual, bilingual and multilingual ones) have at least some dictionary marks, English and Tatar language phraseological dictionaries hardly have any. Only some English
language dictionaries may include such dictionary marks as derog. (= derogatory), impol. (=impolite), taboo и vulg. (= vulgar). Some valuable information about evaluative component of meaning can be found from illustrative examples used in entries of phraseological dictionaries (Ayupova, 2015).

In the meantime, some Russian scientists undertake an attempt to classify them. Babenko (1990) suggests 8 emotive semes. Lukianova (1986) offers a classification of 17 evaluative semes. Arsentieva (2006) classifies emotive semes into 10 types, which include such as affectionate, playfully, ironically, disapproving, neglectfully, improperly, contemptuously, pejoratively, impolite, abusively.

There is no doubt that the suggested gradation can be a subject for discussion. Thus, having studied the evaluative characteristics presented in the dictionaries of all three languages and having analyzed the empirical data, we came to the conclusion that it makes sense to divide the evaluative emotive components into positive, neutral and negative and to classify them into 6 basic groups (Chernova, 2008):
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pejoratively neglectfully disapproving ironically neutrally playfully approving (or positive)

Quite an interesting fact is that negative emotions or evaluations prevail. Kunin (1996) explains this phenomenon by the fact that positive things or deeds do not usually provoke as many as emotions as some negative activities can do.

The part of the scale with negative emotions can be illustrated with such examples as

- blow hot and cold in English, плохо in Russian and жиге сугьы бер черки утеру, бишкэ алып бергэ сату in Tatar, which means to have unstable quality, to produce wrong impression;
- очень плохо (остаться в дураках) in Russian, жиг койрыгын топтып калу, беришес (буш) калу in Tatar, променять кукушку на ястреба (выбрать из плохого худшее) in Russian, сандугачны каргала алытырган, каем бирен юкэ алу, балта бирен шивиле алган in Tatar;
- English idiom choose the lesser of two evils (which is seen as a better way out of the difficult situation, inclines to a positive part of the scale, shows the analytical approach).

Tendency to incline to negative semes proves the necessity of the human being to evaluate, to compare with the socially accepted norms. As soon as we cross
the norms, standards or limits, we characterize this deed or object negatively or pejoratively:

- in English: go beyond all bounds, go over the edge, carry smth. to excess, go to extremes, carry smth. too far, overplay one’s hand, cross the limit,
- in Russian: далеко заходить, хватить через край, перегнуть палку, не знать меры, позволить себе лишнее, переходить всякие границы, ударяться в крайности, выходить из рамок, дойти до ручки, дойти до черты,
- in Tatar: актык чиккэ житу, арттырып жибёрү, артыкка киту, таякны боғеіштерү, бер яктан икенче якка ташлану, киртөөн чыгу, хөөтөөн узу.

Thus, if we compare verbal phraseological units with the meaning of labor activity, we will see that hard and efficient work is to be found in the positive part of the scale and would be considered to be the norm. Work without any result or work up to the exhausted state of the body and mind will be evaluated negatively.

4. Russian

| беездельничать, работать плохо, непродуктивно, безответственно | работать усердно, ответственно, продуктивно, вкладывая душу | работать очень много, напряженно, надрываясь, до изнеможения, надрываться |
| работать спустя рукава | работать засучив рука | гнуть хребет |
| гонять лодыря | работать не покладая рук | ломать спину |
| бить баклуши | уйти с головой в работу | тянуть лямку |
| сидеть сложа руки | работать не разгибая спины | мозолить руки |
| собак гонять | работать как черт | надеть хомут |
| слоны слонять | работать с огоньком | проливать пот |
| играть в бирюльки | заниматься делом | работать как ломовая лошадь |

English

| lie down on the job | rest on one’s oars | plough the sands |
| chase one’s own tail | gild the lily | work body and soul |

| put one’s heart and soul into | work one’s heart out | work one’s fingers to the bone |
| work one’s guts out | break one’s back |
The evaluative scale represents a mixture of social, individual and stereotype images of the world around us; it expresses the subjective attitude of the individual towards some certain object. Defined by the circumstances, life experience and psychological and physical state of the individual, the evaluation may vary and turn from the positive to the negative one and vice versa. The emotive and evaluation scale suggested by us takes all these moments into consideration and defines only those emotions which are universally accepted and recognized in the form of the dictionary marks or emotive semes (Aminova & Yakhina, 2016; Mendes & Silva, 2018).

5. Summary

Linguistic consciousness of a human being is well reflected in the phraseological fund of the English, Russian and Tatar languages. Meaning of verbal phraseological units contains the information, which reflects the form of evaluation of some certain property of the named object or action.

In English the ability to control one’s feelings and not to reveal one’s feelings characterizes human’s behavior as rational, enduring, patient, the one which inevitably leads to positive outcomes (bear and forbear, hold (or keep) oneself in hand, keep one’s balance, keep one’s head, be master of oneself, control one’s temper, face the music, not to ban an eye, keep smth. within bounds, etc.). English speakers tend to be less emotional and capable to self-regulate their feelings.

On the contrary, Russian speakers demonstrate meliorative, positive evaluation of such notions as 'openness', 'sincerity', 'cordiality' 'sociability', 'ease of communication', 'belonging to' one's own’. According to the analysis of the empirical data, the Tatar language is similar with the Russian in terms of being more emotional than rational, if compared with the English language. Accordingly, we find that the English language seems to be less evaluative.
6. Conclusions

All the abovesaid leads us to the conclusion that

- Evaluative component of verbal semantics should be recognized as the ability of phraseological units to express positive or negative attitude of the speaker towards the subject of the delivered message or towards the object of nomination from the standpoint of stable, permanent rather than casual and temporary properties.

- From the perspective of the secondary nomination, the evaluative component acts as the major extralinguistic factor, which is easily explained by its sociolinguistic nature.

- Social factor complicates the semantic structure of the verbal idiomatic phrases related to behavior: basics of morality set the norms of behavior and determine the way they should be followed.

- The actions and state of a human are connected with social relationships, which need a figurative, expressive designation that contains not just the name of a certain way of life, but also its evaluation to a much greater extent than any other action. Behavior should be considered as a subject to qualification from the point of view of good and evil of people's activities, and from taking into account of their value attitude towards people and other objects of reality.

- Behavioral patterns presented in verbal idiomatic phrases are also complex and diverse, as well as the variety of actions performed by a human being.

- To identify the evaluative component in the meaning of verbal idiomatic phrases, one should apply a number of criteria, among which are extralinguistic, semantic, the criterion of the component structure, dictionary emotive marks.

- The Tatar language has a lot in common with the Russian language in terms of the evaluations and values at the time when the English language depicts a more rational, rational perception and evaluation of reality.

- To properly identify the evaluation semantics of the verbal phraseological units related to human behavior in different languages, an analysis of the cultural level is necessary.

The authors of the research do not insist that the data obtained within the presented research answer all the questions but point out the necessity to continue linguistic investigation of the issue under consideration as it will help not only to better understand the cultural differences, but to contribute to the development of the theory of lexicography.
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