How to Cite:

Muminova, A. A. (2021). Linguistic incentive category: definition and classification: example of different systematic languages. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 5(S3), 97-103. https://doi.org/10.37028/lingcure.v5nS3.1396

Linguistic Incentive Category: Definition and Classification: Example of Different Systematic Languages

Aziza Arslonovna Muminova

Senior Lecturer, PhD in Philological Science, Department of General Linguistics, Uzbek State World Languages University, Tashkent, Uzbekistan

> Abstract--- The article discusses the difference between the category of motivation and the modality, that is, it is a type of speech act in which the speaker's wishes, desires, wills, and intentions are given to the listener. While modality refers to the speaker's response to the content of a sentence, the urge is expressed as the speaker's command to the listener. The reason why motivation is separated from modality as a separate category is that it combines several elements under a common motivational semaphore, which on the one hand motivates the addressee to do something as part of a complex whole, but on the other hand they do not intersect. Each component has its own specific motivation, for example: command, request, permission, prohibition, advice, warning, and so on. Motivation as an independent category has a communicative semantic tone and its own structure. The structure of the motivation category consists of a combination of content, transmission, and expression. The content side consists of communicative pragmatic and semantic components, the delivery plan consists of a field of language units that reflect the meaning of the impulse, and the expressive aspect consists of phonological, intonation and graphic parts.

Keywords--- category, discourse, linguoculture, modality, motivation category, sentence semantics, structure, text.

Introduction

In world linguistics, the study of the process of speech activity of various structural languages is of scientific and practical importance. Therefore, in comparative linguistics, special attention should be paid to the fact that the linguocultural features of language units representing consonants in French, Uzbek and Russian languages are not comprehensively analyzed (Hovy, 1993; Spooren & Sanders, 2008). The study of the linguocultural features of language

units that express motivation allows communicators with different national cultures and mentalities to discover the factors that lead to a positive or negative outcome of a speech act that motivates the listener to take action based on their wishes, desires, wills and intentions. Today, in world linguistics, research is being conducted in priority areas, such as the coverage of the expression of the category of motivation, the analysis of their national and cultural characteristics. The science of linguistics is developing rapidly. In this regard, the application of the concept of modality is also expanding exponentially (Goldstone et al., 2001; Kuteeva & Mauranen, 2018).

Method

Modality is the basic unit of speech, the most important component of sentence semantics. When a person expresses a certain idea, he realizes the truth or doubt, belief or doubt of his thought in the speech process in various ways, including the following modal words: probably, maybe, perhaps, apparently, seemingly, visibly, without a doubt, really, indeed, spontaneously and others. Modality is an extremely broad concept, and it is difficult to find similarities in the definitions given to it. The role of V.V. Vinogradov, V.Z. Panfilov, T.B. Alisova in the study of the category of modality from Russian scientists is great, french scientists S. Balli, F. Bruno, E. Cordy, V. Gaklar were also the first in their time to study the category of modality. In Uzbek linguistics, in the category of modality, M.A. Abdurazzakov, G. Abdurahmanov, G. N. Zikrillaev, J. A. Yakubov, S. O. Boymirzaeva, Sh. Rahmatullaev, A. Khojiev, M. Juraeva and others carried away. "The existence of such a wide range of possibilities in the manifestation of the category of modality indicates that this category is a universal phenomenon and that its study is important for understanding the essence of language construction". While V.G.Gak is studying the modality category Gak (2002), he focused on the structure of language in speech and the application of language norms and, consequently, on the correct formation of the structure of French speech (Garaeva, 2014; Rezanova & Khlebnikova, 2015).

According to MA Abdurazzakov: "The nature of modality is expressed in accordance with the language norms of the action that must be performed (with the verb to have to), possible (with the verb power) or impossible (with modality not be able to do). At the heart of the modal content is the participant of the situation, ie the modal subject expressing the desire" (Abdurazzakov, 1985). J.A. Yakubov: "There is no consensus on the content of the modality category and its scope. The complication of the problem is explained by the fact that linguistic modality and logical modality are not completely compatible with each other. Modality is the object of study of both linguistics and logic. In the first, modality is seen as the most important feature of speech, and in the second, it is seen as an important feature of judgment as a form of thinking (Josifova, 2011).

Commenting on the linguistic features of modality, the scientist notes: "In linguistics, this semantic category can be expressed in morphological, lexical and syntactic ways in language, meaning different meanings (*real-noreal*, *possibility*, *necessity*, *desire*, *affirmation-negation*, etc). This means that the category of modality includes a variety of tools that serve to ensure the modality of speech" (Iosifova, 2011). There are many views on how to call modality as a category.

According to K.S. Neustroev, in linguistics this category is a semantic-grammatical category, a broad semantic category, syntactic category, functional-semantic category, communicative-grammatical category, also used as a semantic-communicative category, a semantic-pragmatic category. Among these synonyms, the author prefers the terms of logical-conceptual and functional-semantic category (Narrog, 2005; Barsalou et al., 2003).

S.O. Boymirzaeva, studying the communicative-pragmatic, cognitive features of modality in the context of the Uzbek language material, focused mainly on subjective modality (Boymirzaeva, 2010). J.A. Yakubov generalized the category of modality into one semantic field and divided it into the following broad meaning groups:

- The purpose, attitude, or communicative function of the thought being spoken by the speaker.
- Evaluation of the content of the speech by the speaker from a real and unreal point of view. This modality is represented by inclination forms, verb tenses, as well as some conjunctions and prepositions.
- Assessment of the realities of the speech (possible-probably, necessary-important, desire-wish) by the speaker.
- Relationships in the presence or absence of objects that describe the meanings of affirmation and denial, the reality that represents the real action in the sentence and.
- Evaluation of two types of semantic meanings: Assessment of realities (possible, necessary, desired) by the speaker.
- Determining the level of reliability of the reality reported to him/her by the speaker.
- Expression of emotional (qualitative) and qualitative qualities in the content of speech by the speaker. These semantic concepts are conveyed using prompts, words (good, bad, wonderful, shame, fear, horror) and tone.

Since the term modality refers to the different meanings of a sentence related to the subject, it is expedient to first divide these meanings into two semantic types:

- Objective (anthological).
- Subjective modality.

The first of these reflects the nature of the existing objective relationships in a particular event to which the act of knowing is directed (possibility, reality, necessity). The second represents the speaker's attitude (assessment) to the level of knowledge of these connections (Barak et al., 2016; Dapretto & Bookheimer, 1999). Objective modality finds its expression at the level of syntactic division of a sentence. Its formal indicators:

- Verb tenses (conditional, command, execution, etc).
- Special modal verbs (want, desire, etc).
- Lexical means (compulsory, necessary).

The formal features of modality reflected in the work of J.A. Yakubov on modality are noteworthy. Through subjective modality, the speaker manifests different attitudes to his opinion: trust, affirmation, suspicion, pity, etc. In our view, it is from these aspects of subjective modality that motivation is realized in daily life. "Words that express the speaker's attitude to existence, such as *belief*, *suspicion*, *desire*, are modal words".

Discussion

Words that express the addressee's reaction to the thought being spoken are modal words. Modal words are divided into two groups:

- Modal words that express the accuracy of an idea;
- Modal words that express the uncertainty of thought (Sh, 1980).

In the process of speaking, the clarity, the firmness of the thought is really achieved through the use of words like, of course, surely, certainly. Uses modal words based on human thought. Modal words serve to exaggerate and clarify the idea, helping to express the meaning of affirmation or suspicion in relation to the stated idea. In linguistics, the concept of modality is broad, it has been observed to increase the prestige of ideas in the process of speech as a semantic category. Sh.Balli emphasizes that modal meanings include modal verbs, inclinations, intonation, question and command forms, and pronouns (Charles, 1926).

- F. Bruno writes that in order to express the meaning of modality, modal verbs, auxiliaries, modals, and verb inclinations also serve as semantics of hatred, affirmation, surprise, joy, necessity, rejection, permission (Sh, 1980). The speech process is an important factor in human life. In oral communication, speech is based on certain rules of law. Speech structure is directly related to speech semantics. In this context, the motivational meaning of modality is of particular importance within the context of speech semantics. In the linguistic literature, it can be observed that motivation is studied in two directions:
 - Motivation the appearance of the category of modality, motivational modality (J.A. Yakubov, V.E. Iosifova, E.I. Belyaeva, G.I. Mullayanova, O.V. Goncharova, A.I. Izotov and others.); urge independent category (E.V.Lobanova, A.Yu.Maslova, B.A.Abramov, A.E.Volkova, E.E.Kordi, A.O.Lyubimov, S.Sarantsatsral, E.A.Filatova, K.S. Neustroev et al.). Obviously, it is difficult to define a specific category in language, because, according to M.I. Rasulova, on the one hand, the templates that can be used in categorization are different, on the other hand, it is difficult to determine whether the category structure, ie units, belong to the central or peripheral members (Rasulova, 1998).

In our view, modality and motivation cannot form a single category because they are different concepts. In particular, according to the above-mentioned classification of J.A. Yakubov's modality category, modality is based on the speaker's attitude to the idea: the real and unreal content of the sentence, the presence or absence of the realities in the sentence, the probability, the necessity,

the desire, the convincing uncertainty, and how to evaluate it (Friederici & Weissenborn, 2007; Marslen & Tyler, 1980).

Motivation, in contrast to modality, is "a type of speech act in which the speaker's wishes, desires, wills, and intentions are given to the listener" (Filatova, 1997). That is, if modality reflects the speaker's attitude to the content of the speech, the urge reflects the speaker's command over the listener. The reason for the separation of motivation as a separate category from modality is that it combines several elements under a common motivational semantics, which on the one hand motivate the addressee to action as part of a complex whole, but on the other hand they do not intersect or repeat each other. Each component has its own specific motivation, for example: command, request, permission, prohibition, advice, warning, etc (Haddi et al., 2013; Smith et al., 2018; Woodlove & Vurly, 2017).

Subsection 1

Motivation as an independent category has a communicative semantic tone and its own structure. The structure of the category of encouragement, according to A.Yu. Maslova, consists of a combination of content, transmission and expression. The content side consists of communicative pragmatic and semantic components, the delivery plan consists of a field of language units that reflect the meaning of the impulse, and the expressive aspect consists of phonological, intonation and graphic parts (Maslova, 2009).

Subsection 2

It should be noted that although motivation is a separate category, it is related and similar in many respects to modality, because motivation is a category that is formed on the basis of modality, but has features that differ from it. Like the modality category, the motivation category also has its own content and expression system. The units of language that express urge are diverse, and can be manifested in all aspects of language.

Conclusion

Thus, motivation is understood as a category of language formed on the basis of the category of modality, which reflects many aspects of modality, but is independent, has its own content and expression, its own structure and elements. A.E. Volkova emphasizes that in the implementation of the motivation, the speaker can exert his influence on the wishes of the listener. But his inner experiences are an exception. Motivation is understood as a communicative category and means the motivation of the addressee to the addressee (Volkova et al., 2011).

Acknowledgments

So, motivation is the expression of the speaker's desire, want, will, and intention, and motivates the listener to do something. In the process of motivation, two participants are needed, namely the addressee, in whose presence an act of

speech is formed. In this case, the addressee (German adressant) - a person who represents the spoken communication, to which the speech (text) belongs. Addressee (German adressat) - a person who hears or receives textual (text) speech communication, which is actually or is likely to be. The category of motivation is studied in two aspects: functional semantic and communicative pragmatic. In the functional semantic aspect of motivation, the means of language that express it are explored, and in the communicative pragmatic aspect, the content aspect is studied. In general, the category of motivation as a category of language is also called a functional semantic category, a functional pragmatic category, a communicative category, a communicative semantic category, depending on how it is studied.

References

- Abdurazzakov, M. A. (1985). Semantic structure of the utterance (Semantic types of subjects and predicates. Moscow.
- Barak, M., Watted, A., & Haick, H. (2016). Motivation to learn in massive open online courses: Examining aspects of language and social engagement. *Computers* & *Education*, 94, 49-60. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.compedu.2015.11.010
- Barsalou, L. W., Simmons, W. K., Barbey, A. K., & Wilson, C. D. (2003). Grounding conceptual knowledge in modality-specific systems. *Trends in cognitive sciences*, 7(2), 84-91. https://doi.org/10.1016/S1364-6613(02)00029-3
- Boymirzaeva, S. O. (2010). Categories that shape the communicative-pragmatic content of text in the Uzbek language. Tashkent.
- Charles, B. (1926). Language and life.
- Dapretto, M., & Bookheimer, S. Y. (1999). Form and content: dissociating syntax and semantics in sentence comprehension. *Neuron*, 24(2), 427-432. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0896-6273(00)80855-7
- Filatova, E. A. (1997). Incentive utterances as speech acts in modern Russian. Moscow.
- Friederici, A. D., & Weissenborn, J. (2007). Mapping sentence form onto meaning: The syntax-semantic interface. *Brain research*, 1146, 50-58. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.brainres.2006.08.038
- Gak, V. G. (2002). Speech is correct and speech is authentic // Foreign languages at school. №5. P. 85-89.
- Garaeva, A. (2014). The development of linguocultural competence of students in teaching the history of the English language. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 152, 1012-1018. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.359
- Goldstone, R. L., Lippa, Y., & Shiffrin, R. M. (2001). Altering object representations through category learning. *Cognition*, 78(1), 27-43. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0010-0277(00)00099-8
- Haddi, E., Liu, X., & Shi, Y. (2013). The role of text pre-processing in sentiment analysis. *Procedia Computer Science*, 17, 26-32. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.procs.2013.05.005
- Hovy, E. H. (1993). Automated discourse generation using discourse structure relations. *Artificial intelligence*, 63(1-2), 341-385. https://doi.org/10.1016/0004-3702(93)90021-3

- Iosifova, V. E. (2011). Russian imperative in the grammatical system and in colloquial speech. Moscow.
- Kuteeva, M., & Mauranen, A. (2018). Digital academic discourse: Texts and contexts: Introduction. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dcm.2018.06.001
- Marslen-Wilson, W., & Tyler, L. K. (1980). The temporal structure of spoken language understanding. *Cognition*, 8(1), 1-71. https://doi.org/10.1016/0010-0277(80)90015-3
- Maslova, A. Y. (2009). The communicative-semantic category of incentive and its implementation in the Slavic languages (based on the material of the Serbian and Bulgarian languages in comparison with Russian. Moscow.
- Narrog, H. (2005). On defining modality again. *Language sciences*, 27(2), 165-192. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2003.11.007
- Rasulova, M. I. (1998). Problems of lexical categorization in linguistics: Tashkent.
- Rezanova, Z. I., & Khlebnikova, A. L. (2015). Gender metaphors in Russian and English linguocultures: a comparative study. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 215, 273-278. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.11.634
- Sh, S. (1980). others. Particles/Modern Uzbek literary language. *T.: Teacher*, 432-438.
- Smith, V.., Florence, K.., & Maria, F.. (2018). Semantics in cultural perspective overview. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 2(1), 24-31.
- Spooren, W., & Sanders, T. (2008). The acquisition order of coherence relations: On cognitive complexity in discourse. *Journal of pragmatics*, 40(12), 2003-2026. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2008.04.021
- Volkova, E. A., Popov, A. M., & Tikhonova, O. V. (2011). Ionization and stabilization of atoms in a high-intensity, low-frequency laser field. *Journal of Experimental and Theoretical Physics*, 113(3), 394-406.
- Woodlove, G. M. ., & Vurly, M. E. . (2017). Political discourse approach applied the current study issue occurred. *Linguistics and Culture Review*, 1(1), 26-37.