

THE CONCEPT OF CATEGORY OF ADVICE LINGUISTICS

*Uzbekistan state world languages university
The department of TESL, teacher
Xasanova Dilorom Shavkat qizi
tefon0619@gmail.com*

Abstract: A category in linguistics refers to a group of entities that have similar traits or abilities, and it is a crucial component in the structure of dialect. Syntactic, semantic, and morphological categories are important for arranging language data and promoting communication.

Key words: category, advice, directness, advertising texts, imperatives.

The idea of category is fundamental to linguistics and is a key framework for comprehending a language's structures and abilities. In linguistics, categories are generally defined as classes of substances that have similar properties, allowing linguistic information to be arranged and rearranged. By examining their historical development, classifications, and the intelligence between various categories, this chapter aims to explore the complex nature of categories in linguistics. By analyzing different insightful works, counting those of A. Bondarko (1971), V. Vinogradov (1975), and A. Wezhbickaya (1997), this chapter will illustrate how categories are not as it were fundamental for the auxiliary perspectives of dialect but too for its semantic and down to business measurements.

The concept of category in linguistics serves as a principal system for understanding the organization and work of dialect, as highlighted by the works of different researchers. A. Bondarko in his seminal work “Grammatical Category and Context” emphasizes the complex relationship between syntactic categories and the relevant components that shape their utilization. He contends that categories are not only unique classifications; or maybe, they are profoundly entwined with the communicative setting, impacting how meaning is built, passed on, and deciphered in talk.¹ Essentially, A. Wezhbickaya in her persuasive work “Language, Culture, Cognition” investigates the interaction between dialect and social cognition, stating that categories are molded by social standards and cognitive forms. She sets that phonetic categories are not confined builds; instep, they reflect the cognitive systems and social settings in which they are inserted. For illustration, the way certain dialects categorize colors or family relationship terms can uncover fundamental social values

¹ Бондарко А.В. Грамматическая категория и контекст. - Л.; «Наука», 1971.– 112 с.

and social structures, illustrating that dialect may be a reflection of human involvement and cognition.²

This viewpoint underscores the thought that linguistic categories reflect not only auxiliary components of dialect but also the social and cognitive systems inside which language works. By analyzing categories through the focal points of both linguistic setting and social cognition, analysts can pick up a more nuanced understanding of how language capacities as an apparatus for communication. Together, the experiences from A. Bondarko and A. Wezhbickaya highlight the complexity and dynamism of categories in linguistics, outlining how they serve as basic instruments for analyzing dialect both as an organized framework of communication and as a reflection of human thought, culture, and social interaction. Eventually, this coordinates approach to the analysis of categories improves our comprehension of the multifaceted nature of dialect, uncovering the significant associations between phonetic structure, setting, and culture.

The complicated relationship between dialect, assessment, and the part of the group of onlookers may be a basic zone of ponder in phonetics, as highlighted by a few key researchers. E. Wolff in his seminal work “Functional Semantics of Evaluation,” dives into the mechanics of evaluative language, positing that such language isn't simply a vehicle for communicating individual conclusions but serves an imperative work in forming recognitions and directing the reactions of the gathering of people. He emphasizes that evaluative expressions—such as descriptive words, qualifiers, and modular verbs—carry critical weight in communication, as they can impact how a message is deciphered and caught on.³ For instance, an explanation that utilizes solid evaluative dialect can inspire passionate reactions and influence suppositions, outlining the control of semantics in enticing talk.

Building upon Wolff's bits of knowledge, O. Vorobyeva in her work “Printed Categories and the Calculate of the Recipient” looks at the basic part that gathering of people characteristics play within the development and translation of printed categories. She contends that compelling communication requires a profound understanding of the audience's foundation, desires, and social setting, which in turn educates the phonetic choices made by the speaker or essayist. Also, A. Goncharov addresses the concepts of negation and modality in his study, highlighting their pivotal parts in forming meaning and communicating states of mind within discourse. He notes that the transaction between modality—such as need, plausibility, or obligation—and refutation can essentially modify the quality of declarations and the speaker's position.⁴

² Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание. М., '«Русские словари»', 1997.—411с

³ Вольф Е.М. Функциональная семантика оценки. - М., '«Наука»', 1985.—226 с.

⁴ Гончаров А.М. Отрицание и модальность. Хакас, гос. ун-т им. Н.Ф. Катанова, Абакан; 1996.— 7с.

For occasion, a modular expression like “You must not do this” not as it were passes on disallowance but also suggests a commitment that can bring out a more grounded response than a straightforward refutation, such as “You do not have to do this.” This nuanced understanding of modality and refutation underscores the complexity of meaning development in communication.

Moreover, T. Van Dijk, in his persuasive work “Language, Cognition, Communication,” emphasizes the cognitive and communicative measurements of dialect. He contends that understanding dialect includes recognizing how cognitive forms and social contexts interplay to shape meaning. T. Van Dijk sets that language could be an instrument for social interaction, and the cognitive instruments that underlie dialect utilize are fundamental for compelling communication. His examination highlights the significance of setting, proposing that the implications of words and expressions can move depending on the situational, social, and social components at play.⁵

When combined, these scholars provide a thorough framework for examining the intricacies of dialect usage and how it affects comprehension and translation. They highlight the idea that effective communication may be an active handle that necessitates careful consideration of various association components by examining the components of evaluative dialect, gathering of people components, and cognitive measurements of communication. This coordinated approach not only offers useful recommendations for domains like talk investigation, talk, and intercultural communication, where dialect nuances can significantly impact the success of communicative endeavors, but it also in some ways advances our understanding of linguistic marvels. The experiences gleaned from these ponders ultimately demonstrate the dialect's complex nature as a social tool and cognitive tool, reflecting the intricacies of human comprehension and interaction.

References:

1. Бондарко А.В. Грамматическая категория и контекст. - Л.; «Наука», 1971.– 112 с
2. Ван Дейк Т.А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация.-М.; «Прогресс»,1989 .–311 с.
3. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание. М., ' «Русские словари» ,1997.–411с
4. Вольф Е.М. Функциональная семантика оценки. - М.,' «Наука», 1985 .–226 с.
5. Гончаров А.М. Отрицание и модальность. Хакас, гос. ун-т им. Н.Ф. Катанова, Абакан; 1996.– 7с.

⁵ Ван Дейк Т.А. Язык. Познание. Коммуникация.-М.; «Прогресс»,1989 .–311 с.