

## Peculiarities of Using Non-Categorical Statements in Publicistic Texts in English and Russian Languages

Mukhamedova Nigora Abdulkhaevna

Senior lecturer of the English methodology department Uzbekistan State University of World Languages, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

**Annotation:** The article deals with the comprehensive comparative study of one of the categories of statements that function in the scientific register of communication - non-categorical affirmative statements. The use of non-categorical statements in an English text is regulated to a certain extent by a stricter standard of written communication; in a Russian-language text, the use of non-categorical statements is not regulated by the norm and depends on the motives and strategies of the authors of the texts. The subject area of this study investigates the linguistic texts in English and Russian languages.

**Keywords:** comparative linguistics, linguistic texts, non-categorical affirmative statements, semantics, pragmatics, communication.

### INTRODUCTION

Interlingual comparison of the semantics and pragmatics of linguistic means and ways of expression that orient the reader to one or another evaluative position taken by the author on the issue under discussion is one of the important and at the same time insufficiently studied issues of comparative linguistics. A special role in this is played by the study of such a unit of speech as an utterance. In scientific texts affirmative statements act as one of the most frequent and relevant forms of expression. They realize the main function of scientific communication - the function of verbal reflection, modeling of extralinguistic reality. This function is called differently: cognitive, denotative, referential (R. Jakobson), descriptive (J. Lyons), representative or ideational (M.A.K. Halliday). In this study, it seems reasonable to use the term "cognitive function". This function corresponds to the objective component of the content plan of scientific text units, i.e. names, noun phrases or sentential type expressions used to express knowledge. Along with this component, which refers to the referent of the statement and constitutes the objective content of the corresponding unit of the scientific text (proposition), in the scientific text, as a rule, there are statements with such functional parameters as reality/unreality, possibility/impossibility, and truth/probability.

### DISCUSSIONS

Affirmative statements expressing, indirectly representing indirectly or implying the result of an assessment of propositional content in terms of the category of probability are designated as non-categorical in functional style [Razinkina, 1989]. In text theory and pragma-linguistics, non-categorical statements are considered as one of the means of expressing the semantic category of the text level - the category of probablification [Paducheva, 2004]. In a non-categorical statement, which in a logical aspect corresponds to a conclusion, a connection is established between the result of intellectual activity (theory, concept, idea) and its rational (logical) assessment. Such an assessment can express non-contradiction, agreement, coincidence of opinions of its source and the person to whom the assessment belongs, or, conversely, objection, disagreement and divergence of

points of view! on the object of research, as well as doubt about the truth / reliability / reliability of the evaluated ideas or research results - both someone else's and one's own. Evaluative statements that form the linguistic fabric of a scientific text act not just as a means of informing its reader about the state of affairs in the area under study, but represent an opportunity realized by the subject of speech! Bring to a one-to-one correspondence language means that have a certain conceptual content, and their knowledge and assessments, and express their attitude to the subject of speech. The objectification of the attitude to the subject of speech in a scientific text is a verification of the truth of what is being said and confirmation of the assessment that served as its basis.

As is known, the problems of text theory are reflected in the works of many domestic linguists [Aleksandrova, 1984; Arnold, 1981; Arutyunova, 1999; Budagov, 1976; Valgina, 2004; Vorozhbitova, 2005; Zolotova, 1995; Galperin, 1981; Kovtunova, 1976; Moskalskaya, 1981; Papin, 2002; Pocheptsov, 1990; Solganik, 2005], but their number continues to grow. Among Russian studies, the study of scientific and popular science texts can be singled out as a special direction [Bulygina, 1990; Lapteva, 1976; Queen, 2004; Kostyurova, 1997; Matveeva, 1984; Najer, 1984; Razinkina, 1978, 1989; Svoikin, 2006; Turaeva, 1985]. Formal and semantic, i.e. the actual linguistic, as well as communicative-pragmatic characteristics of the text are also covered by numerous foreign studies [Chafe, 1976; T.A. van Dijk, 1997; Fodor, 1991; Gazdar, 1979; Harvey 1997; Hanania and Akhtar, 1984; Kaplan 1997; Salager-Meyer, 1997; Swales, 1990]. However, many problems of the scientific text are still far from being solved. This situation is due to several factors.

Firstly, despite the abundance of scientific research devoted to the problems of text in domestic and foreign linguistics, works on artistic, newspaper-magazine and everyday communication still prevail among them. There is much less research in the field of the language of the scientific register of communication, although without studying the language means used in texts of a scientific nature, it is impossible to present a complete description of the language system in connection with the functions it performs.

Secondly, the focus of text research in the mid-20th century was the problems of genre and style, originally related to the conduct of literary criticism and functional stylistics. Questions of the integrity and coherence of the text and units of its segmentation were highlighted. In text linguistics and pragmalinguistics, the questions of the semantics and pragmatics of language means and modes of expression, the motives for their choice and their influencing force were raised.

Modern studies of text linguistics, which is developing in line with the cognitive approach to language and speech activity, are aimed at a comprehensive consideration of the issues of selection / choice of language means, their influence on the argumentative power of statements and their role in the formation, differentiation and translation into text of various types of knowledge reflected in them. . The main task of this work is a comprehensive study and comparison of the structural-semantic and communicative-pragmatic properties of English-language and Russian-language non-categorical statements that objectify the intellectual and evaluative attitude of the author of a linguistic text to the subject of his speech. In a scientific text, statements of this category orient the reader to the intellectual evaluative position that the author takes on the issue under discussion.

Due to the system of assessments fixed in the psyche of any individual and used in the process of thinking, this or that information acquires for him the property of authenticity (reliability) or probability. As a result of evaluating this information, the subject of speech can inform and express in the text his conviction or only an opinion, or even an assumption about what is being reported. A

special role in the study of this phenomenon is played by such a unit of text as a statement. Statements of an information-evaluative nature act not just as a means of informing about the state of affairs, but represent an opportunity realized by the subject of speech to bring language means that have a certain conceptual content, and their knowledge and assessments, to one-to-one correspondence. As part of informational and evaluative statements that form the linguistic fabric of scientific texts in different languages, various means of expressing confidence, doubt and incomplete confidence in the truth of what is being reported are used. These means are determinatives, or markers of the cognitive activity of the subject of speech - the author of a scientific text.

### **MATERIALS AND ANALYSIS**

Statements appearing in linguistic texts, as a rule, have the properties of judgments, since they contain means of expressing the relationship of propositional contents to reality. The properties of judgments act as one of the most important objects of formal logic. Judgments can express various assessments of objects and events based on different types of knowledge: "knowledge by description" or "knowledge about the subject" and "knowledge of the concept of the subject". This knowledge can influence both the establishment of the degree of significance of a particular feature for characterizing the described object, and the truth or reliability of this characteristic expressed in the statement. The characteristic of a judgment, which changes depending on whether it asserts the possibility, reality, or necessity of something, is its mode, or logical modality.

The expression in the judgment of a logical (intellectual) assessment of knowledge or opinions formed as a result of scientific knowledge is determined by units belonging to the category of epistemic modality. This characteristic of judgments refers to the cognitive aspect of their content, i.e. to knowledge of the subject. Expressed in statements such as "Johnson listed several image schemas, but he seems not to regard these simply as image structures" (Cognitive Linguistics - 213); "In any work of art there are such elements of the text that, relatively speaking, cannot be translated ..." (Arutyunova - 192) epistemological (epistemic) modality is a characteristic related to the knowledge of the subject of speech. This characteristic is also expressed, among other things, by modal units, such as probably, possibly, may be (probably, possibly, maybe). Linguistic modality, according to The Oxford English Grammar, "... is a semantic category that deals with two types of judgments: (1) those referring to the factuality of what is said (its certainty, probability, or possibility); (2) those referring to human control over the situation (ability, permission, intention)" [5].

The studies of philosophers and psychologists and linguists confirm that the basis on which the diversity of languages is built is formed by the categories of thought, which I. Kant singled out as categories of reason. Although in different languages different means of expression may be used to express mental categories, these categories themselves are universal mental phenomena that appear in the field of cognition. B. Lee Whorf noted that many mental categories have their analogues in the sensory perception of the world, therefore, the meaning of linguistic expressions correlate with human experience and orient these meanings to experience demonstrated intersubjectively. This makes the content of the meaning of mental categories a unique starting point for studying the problem of displaying cognitive processes both in the content and in the formal language plans of various situations of communication. One such universal category is probability. The problem of expressing probability by means of verbal communication raises a number of important questions, primarily philosophical in nature. The term "probability" has several meanings and is used in different situations. Probability is directly related to: - epistemological questions (for example, are there statements about facts that can be considered absolutely probable?); - to questions of a

teleological nature (for example, if our knowledge is quite probable, then is this probability provided by a revelation from above, or is it in principle no different from a probability of this kind, for example, as the probability of information about the far side of the Moon?); - to ethical issues (does it make sense to regard certain actions as probably right, and their results as probably useful; should we choose in our actions the most probable alternative, the most useful, or the alternative, the product of the probability of implementation of which by utility has a maximum value ?); to metaphysical and ontological arguments.

In general, the words probability (probability) and their synonyms in English and Russian are rather vague in meaning. In Russian, these are, first of all, the words plausibility and reliability; in English they correspond to the nouns likelihood, plausibility and the adjectives probable, likely, plausible. Likewise, these nouns and adjectives may refer to anything that is not fully specified and may serve to indicate the most favorable alternative.

Both in statements can indicate the degree of confirmation of the truth and the degree of confidence of the speaker in the truth of what is being said (the degree of truth confirmed on the basis of available facts and the degree of truth established on the basis of some evidence). Therefore, it is necessary to distinguish between judgments about probability and probabilistic judgments (evaluative interpretation of judgments). In this study, we will go further about statements expressing probability as an incomplete confirmation of the truth. We designate these statements as non-categorical. The analysis of English and Russian linguistic texts makes it possible to combine statements in which the modal operator of possibility (probability) is represented into one general class - non-categorical statements.

Since these units arise as a result of reflection, and contain doubts, opinions, assumptions, O.A. Aleksandrova combines the words and expressions used in them into the general category of deliberativeness. Deliberation is expressed by, for example, perhaps, sometimes, somewhat, in general, in a sense, it seems, let us say, on the whole, so to speak [2]. The meaning of the non-categorical nature of the asserted can be expressed only in syntactic constructions, the lexico-phraseological and structural-grammatical constituents of which are combined into a single whole insofar as they express the result of evaluating the reported. The inclusion of one of the words or expressions of a given category in the construction of an utterance as a (subjective-modal) operator may be accompanied by the activation of the grammatical form of the utterance. The activation of the form occurs either as a result of a violation of its solidity (by insertion), or in the case of inclusion, which leads to a complication of the membership. Represented by various formal indicators of subjective modality, the activation of the form of an utterance leads to changes in the content of the corresponding utterances.

Non-categorical statements express probabilistic, not truthful knowledge. A probabilistic marker in the construction of a non-categorical statement is a modifying constituent - a morpheme, word, phrase or sentence. In a number of cases this constituent forms the modal frame of the utterance: "That is many people, this is maximally offensive language" (Crystal - 131). In terms of subject semantics, this constituent is secondary in relation to the modified constituent, but in terms of speech act and modal semantics, it is decisive. Linguistic texts use several implementation variants of non-categorical statements. The structural-grammatical difference between them lies in the relationship established between them and what position the modifying constituent takes in relation to the modified constituent. This constituent can be included in the composition of the sentence as its minor member or as one of the elements of the sentence member, for example:

(1) "If evaluative nominations are supported by an anaphora referring to the pretext, or a deixis, they can take the place of the subject of a particular sentence" (Arutyunova - 8).

In this example, "If the evaluative nominations are supported by an anaphora referring to the pretext, or a deixis" is an included utterance element that acts as a modal frame that reduces the truth value of the proposition. Can - an element located inside the propositional content of the utterance, a member of the compound verbal predicate. (2) "Passers-by can be horrified at the language of young people nowadays" (Crystal -131).

The modifying constituent in the constructions under consideration can be elements by means of which: a) the expressed propositive content can be clarified or explained (interpretive constructions); b) the expressed propositive content can be supplemented by the expression of an evaluative attitude (commenting constructions).

According to the functional-communicative approach, scientific texts form a special register of communication; in which various speech acts appear, among which RA stand out, the production and perception of which does not cause changes in the external objective reality and which are a means of realizing the need for knowledge of the environment and self-knowledge. A scientific text can be considered as a series of communicative acts, the producers of which express knowledge, explain and confirm their points of view, their understanding of a particular phenomenon, real or imaginary object or event, and express them in a dialogue with a real or imaginary opponent. Scientific hypotheses appear in such speech forms as description, explanation and reasoning. At the moment when "a hypothesis - a conceptual model that causes a conflict in a value system - fully adapts to a given system of knowledge and enters it as an element of a value structure" [Varshavskaya et al., 2002], a scientific text ceases to be relevant.

The position that the authorship of the text in scientific communication is realized in many ways is consistently developed in the linguo-cognitive approach. The utterance as a unit of speech, which forms the linguistic fabric of a scientific text, can and should be considered not just as a means of communication, but as an opportunity realized by the subject of speech - a native speaker of the language, to bring to a one-to-one correspondence linguistic means that have a certain conceptual content, and their knowledge, beliefs, opinions. This idea of the authorship of a scientific text, which has developed in line with linguistic and non-linguistic approaches to the study of the problems of scientific communication, determines the application of an integrated approach to the object of study. In this comprehensive comparative study of English-language and Russian-language scientific linguistic texts, we will rely on the following main provisions of modern linguistics.

## CONCLUSION

In the considered texts, one can observe a different degree of correspondence between the linguistic form of the utterance and its meaning: both topological isomorphism and allomorphy. The topological isomorphism (analogy) of conceptual contents and structural-grammatical forms in the analyzed scientific texts is manifested, for example, in the fact that the form of the two-part construction (Prop) + (X), which non-categorical statements have, is similar to the semantic (logical) connection that exists between its constituents. This property of these utterances can be used as the basis of a special device designed to update or de-actualize the meaning.

Non-categorical statements in English and Russian linguistic texts are functionally heterogeneous. Their functioning can be considered in the stylistic aspect - in terms of following the norm/stereotype of written scientific communication by the authors of the texts; secondly - in the

cognitive aspect - in terms of the nature of the communicated knowledge. Thirdly, they are directly related to marking the authorship of a scientific text. Fourthly, they have a certain pragmatic potential - in terms of reducing the influencing power of statements. Finally, fifthly, the probable use of statements has the potential to establish a dialogic relationship between the author and his imaginary or real reader. In general, their choice is determined by: epistemic motive; it is directly related to the results of the categorization of the represented referent and the type of knowledge transferred from the author of a scientific text to its reader; pragmatic motive; it is determined by the conditions of scientific communication and the author's speech strategies.

### References:

1. Arutyunova, N. D. Language and the human world. Text. / N.D.Arutyunova. M.: Languages of Russian culture. - M., 1999. - I-IX. - 896 p.
2. Jordanskaya, L.N., Melchuk, I.A. Meaning and compatibility in the dictionary Text. / L.N. Jordanskaya, I.A. Melchuk. 2007. - 672 p.
3. Kobozeva, I.M. Linguistic semantics Text. / THEM. Kobozeva. M.: 2004. - 352 p.
4. Kubryakova, E.S. Language and knowledge: On the way to gaining knowledge about language: Parts of speech from a cognitive point of view. The role of language in the knowledge of the world. Text. / E.S. Kubryakova / Ros. Academy of Sciences; Institute of Linguistics. M.: 2004. - 560 p.
5. Baranov, A.N. Introduction to applied linguistics: textbook / A.N. Baranov. Ed. 2nd, rev. - M.: 2003. -360 p.
6. Barth, R. Text Linguistics Text. / R. Bart; per. T.D. Karelskaya // Text: aspects of the study of semantics, pragmatics and poetics: a collection of articles. -M.: Editorial URSS, 2001. P. 168-175.
7. Bakhtin, M.M. The problem of speech genres Text. / MM. Bakhtin // Aesthetics of verbal creativity. -M.: 1979. P. 334-371.
8. M. Belyaeva, E.I. Epistemic modality in English and Russian languages. Text. / E.I. Belyaeva // Contrastive Grammar: Sat. scientific tr. - Kalinin: Publishing House of Kalinin University, 1984. - P. 36-52.
9. Benveniste, E. General Linguistics Text. / E. Benveniste. M.: Progress, 1974.-447 p.1 b. Bolinger, D. Truth is a linguistic problem Text. / D. Bolinger // Language and modeling of social interaction. M.: Nauka, 1987.-P. 17-18.
10. Bloomfield, JL Language / JT. Bloomfield. M.: Progress, 1968. - 607 p.
11. Bondarko, A.B. Categorical situations. M., 1983. - No. 2. - P. 20-22.