

UDC 81'367.5:81'37: 811.161.2'367
doi: 10.15330/jpnu.9.2.71-78

Section: WORD AND TIME

SEMANTIC POTENTIAL OF REPRESENTATIVES OF DOUBT IN EXPRESSING IRREAL STATES

NATALIYA MAGAS

Abstract. The research examines ways of expressing doubt as one of the communicative acts in correlation with the opposition of reality and irreality in the Ukrainian language. Nowadays the research of doubt and its representatives takes a peripheral place in works on modality, most often being observed in comparative works, regardless of the fact that the integral means of its representation are at the same time indicators of irreality at the lexical, syntactic and pragmatic levels. This is primarily explained by the semantic diffuseness and synsematicity of the expression of doubt in the Ukrainian language, which affects the difficulty of typologizing its representatives in the structure of the semantic category of irreality. Doubt as a syncretic emotional and evidential modus component, on the one hand, is an intellectual search impulse, that leads to the subject's verification of a certain extralinguistic situation depending on its correspondence to the real or irreal, which allows it to be considered in the plane of evidential semantics; on the other hand, the extensive ways of representing doubt and their aspectual characteristics point out its potential in expressing other irreal meanings in specific cases.

Keywords: category of irreality/reality, modality, evidentiality, irrealis.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the study is to determine and describe the peculiarities of irreal states expression by representatives of the ambiguous sentence structure in the contemporary Ukrainian language. The research is focused on certain meanings of irreality, which are most productively are found in doubt representation: prognosticity, counterfactuality, evidentiality, and deonticity; certain cases of syncretic expression of the meaning of irreality, which depends on the specificity of doubt as a category, are determined in the polemic with previous studies of doubt.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

The subject of research is doubt as a modus category. The representatives of doubt in the scope of the opposition of reality and irreality in the sentence structure are the object of research. Features of the communicative situation of doubt are its performativity, connection with positive expressions (preliminary characteristics of the situation) in interactions, positivity, negative expression, subjectivity, a high share of emotional modality, semantic diffuseness with

situations of probability, suspicion, surprise and denial; as well as systematic representation using various linguistic means of expression in the communicative act, with the exception of direct nomination through the verbs «сумніватися», «вагатися» in a separate type of explained evidential doubt (Dotsenko, 2006, p. 225).

It is important to clarify that doubt is most often verbalized in interaction, or is an element of the subject's internal discussion, and its integral parameter is opposition to the existing description of the real situation. Thus, the main semantic potential of any means of verbalizing doubt is the formation of the opposition «reality/irreality», that was not observed before. As a result, there are not many specific lexical and syntactic means of expressing doubt in the Ukrainian language, and for its representation as part of a certain communicative situation, various linguistic means can be included in systemic relationship.

As being indicated, modern linguistic studies focus on doubt in comparative dissection, or peripherally define its aspects when studying modality. Among the main works in Ukrainian linguistics devoted to doubt can be found the research papers of O. Krasnenko (in a comparative analysis of the means of expressing doubt and close modal categories in Ukrainian and French discourse), O. Dotsenko (defining doubt as one of the manifestations of evidential modality) and others.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To demonstrate the potential of the representatives of doubt in expressing irreal meanings, it is necessary to distinguish the integral and peripheral means of expression of this modus category. The verbs «сумніватися», «вагатися» are integral representatives of the communicative situation of doubt, where the verb «сумніватися» mainly refers to the situation of an alternative choice that appears to the subject. In this case, the opposition «reality/irreality» arises only as a consequence of the communicator's reflection, belongs to the prognostic category of irreal meanings, therefore, in our study, we will not pay attention to this representative. Thus, for example, in the sentence *Коротше, вагався середній брат, вагався, проводив неабияку внутрішню духовну роботу із самим собою - і зрешию таки став... священнослужителем* (Т. Литовченко), the verb of the imperfective aspect in the past tense «вагався» introduces the opposition: to be or not to be a clergyman (according to the example in Ukrainian), that in the end is presented as real, that is, in the end the subject made a decision, the irreal became real, because the subject was not a priest before.

The verb «гадаєш» in the prepositive position at the beginning of an interrogative sentence is also important for expressing the emotion of doubt in the Ukrainian language. With its help, the subject of communication characterizes the opposing opinion as unlikely or false, indicating doubt in the source of the information: *Гадаєш, вони матимуть достатньо зброї, щоб дати раду цьому покидьку?* (О. Субчак). *Ти гадаєш, що мені бракує волі і я не можу бути відважним?* (М. Хвильовий). The subject expresses doubt about the ability of the source of information to correctly assess a possible situation, and also interprets the latter as irreal. Hence, we underline a syncretic representation of the deontic-evidential meaning of irreality in the communicative situation of doubt, since the denial is aimed at both the communicator and the model of the proposed situation. In the sentence *Гадаєш, достатньо зброї* the introduced proposition *достатньо зброї* is irreal, that is, in reality there are not enough weapons. Or in *Гадаєш, ... я не можу бути відважним?* where the proposition is introduced by the predicate «гадаєш» also conveys a non-actualized state, that is, the subject may or may not be brave, which is also perceived as irreal until the subject's courage is fully manifested, if it happens. Typical representatives of doubt, in addition to the syntactic model, where the situation is characterized in a regular sentence, are also negative

predicative constructions and adverbs of the qualitative-denotative and quantitative-denotative type: *достатньо, невдало, не дуже*, etc.

The Ukrainian language is also characterized by the representation of doubt with the adverb «напевно». As in the previous cases, doubt is manifested by the subject of communication or determined from the point of view of a third person. Its specific feature is the expression of the emotional-expressive component, which indicates not the logical understanding of a certain situation as irreal, false from the subject's point of view, but the emotional state of the communicator or the source of information about reality: *Слухай, це не занадто?... – непевно смикнув його за рукав Варфоломійович. (М. Гримич)*. In the same way, this representative is realized in the irreal meaning of prognosticity, where the subject simulates an imaginary situation, being defined by him/her as unlikely, false or impossible: *Може, відібрати в дідуся пістолет? – непевно сказав наш молодий герой, оскільки ніяк не міг сконцентруватися на оповіді (М. Гримич)*.

Peripheral representatives of doubt are the following linguistic means (Krasnenko, 2013, p. 176):

1. Modal particles *хіба, невже, наврод, наврод чи, начебто, чи не, мабуть*.
2. Adverbs *сумнівно, непевно, недовірливо*.
3. Modal words *можливо, здається, по-моєму*.
4. Modal phrases *як на мене*.
5. Interrogative constructions with idiomatic particles at the beginning of the sentence *невже, хіба, чи, а якщо, а раптом, наче, наче і не*.

The most common situations of doubt are the following four:

- 1) The subject does not have sufficient information about certain signs or features of a real situation, as a result of which he/she interprets it as completely or partially irreal (counterfactual meaning of irreality).
- 2) The subject is faced with a choice between two opposite and equal characteristics of the situation, not knowing which of them is real and which is irreal (evidential meaning).
- 3) The subject has an oppositional point of view on a certain situation, which contradicts its existing characteristics.
- 4) The subject verbalizes a hypothetical model of the situation opposite to the existing one.

As a result of the analysis of the corpus of means of representation of doubt in the contemporary Ukrainian language, the following types of situations of doubt are manifested depending on certain categories of irreality:

1. Doubt-assumption, which involves modeling a hypothetical situation: *Все начебто зроблено вже (А. Головка)*.
2. Doubt-possibility, which is aimed at the destruction of a potential situation: *Наврод чи десь по інших країнах співають так гарно й голосисто, як у нас на Україні (О. Довженко)*.
3. Doubt-probability, in which a situation is modeled that, from the point of view of the subject of the statement, has more in common with reality than a prepositive one: *Але як видно, то вже й тоді не перебирали засобами політичної боротьби... (Всесвіт. №1)*.
4. Doubt-evidentiality, which involves doubting previous or existing inferences and favors further logical analysis of the subject: *Це, очевидно, тому, що старе мистецтво припускало момент споглядання? (М. Хвильовий)*.
5. Doubt-expressant aimed at expressing the emotional state of the subject of speech or represents doubt and mistrust of one's own condition or the ability to draw logical conclusions: *Невже я божеволію?... – думала вона (О. Бердник)*.
6. Doubt-clarification, which represents mistrust of a separate part of the hypothetical situation and is aimed at overcoming the opposition «real/irreal» during the interaction: *Хіба виживе Лавр, – засумнівався князь (С. Батурын)*.

7. Doubt-evaluation, in which the evaluation is also represented from the point of view of possibility/impossibility and the degree of irreality of a certain situation or meaning: *Здоровило! Хіба я в силі його побороти?* (О. Бердник) *Він???* Борис непевно відповів: – *Мало схожий.* (А. ІВАНОВ).

The two main types of doubt, depending on the representation of one or another subcategory of irreality, are prospective doubt and retrospective or counterfactual. The first is characterized by the subject's formulation of an alternative model of the future, which differs from the existing assumption or is opposed to the pro-positive component of speech, often with a negative expressive characteristic: *Хіба виживе Лавр, — засумнівався князь.* (С. Батурич). The second is characterized by a complete or partial denial of a real situation that happened in the past: *Хто його вбив? Кримінальники? Сумнівно. Підрозділ Ордену? Його не могли вбити без дозволу Коммодора* (В. Єшкілев). Accordingly, the most representative doubt will be explicated in the following semantic subcategories of irreality:

Predictability

The prognostic meaning of irreality appears in the communicative situation of doubt, when the subject of the speech models a hypothetical situation, which, from his/her point of view, is the opposite of reality and cannot be realized in the future: *Навряд чи Олег Рибалка буде проситися назад, прийде з мільйоном пурпурових троянд і впаде в ноги.* (А. Кокотюха). The main representatives of this meaning will be the particles *hardly*, *hardly* and the conditional future tense of verbs: *Але ресторанній дівці **навряд чи** дошкулить така іронія.* (П. Вежинов). A specific feature of the realization of this meaning of irreality with the help of sum representatives is its certain communicative redundancy and self-reflective destruction: the subject of speech models a situation that cannot happen in reality, and at the same time denies it. With the help of the given representatives, as well as words with a negative expression, an ironic effect is also created. The central syntactic representatives of doubt in the prognostic type of semantics of irreality are complex ordinal sentences of various types, in which the model of the future is characterized as irreal in the ordinal part: *Хотів би побачити, як тобі це вдасться, — засумнівався Глинський* (В. Рутківський). In addition to the above-mentioned typical representatives of doubt, lexemes with a negative expression, as well as linguistic units in voluntaristic expression, etc., are used to form a negative, irreal situation. The peculiarity of such representatives of doubt is that they are completely devoid of an evidentiary, i.e., logical component, as they express only the subjective point of view of the communicator regarding the reality of a possible (irreal) situation characterized by the opponent.

Counterfactuality

Unlike the prognostic type of irreality in a situation of doubt, the counterfactual meaning of irreality is based on the denial of a certain situation of reality or its individual features, which from the point of view of the subject of the statement do not correspond to reality. Thus, it is possible to divide the expression of this meaning in the communicative situation of doubt into full/complete and partial/incomplete counterfactuality. In the first case, the subject of the statement questions the part of reality that is expressed in a positive statement in the interaction or denies a specific fact or situation: *Підходиш до дівчини, яка тобі сподобалася, питаєш її, чи згодна вона вийти за тебе, — **і все.** — **А що, коли** вона гарбуза дасть? — засумнівався Демко* (В. Рутківський). In this type, doubt is expressed mainly by interrogative sentences that begin with particles *a*, *a що* which form a complete opposition to the previous statement. As already mentioned, interrogative sentences in the communicative situation of doubt are one of the integral markers at the syntactic level; the subject of speech does not intent to a total denial of a certain statement, but models a negative, irrealistic situation for its further clarification or destruction.

With partial/incomplete counterfactuality, the subject of communication denies only a certain aspect of reality: *Давно вже не були у нас в маєтку. — Хіба давно? — вуйко Вітольд якось непевно глянув на небожа* (Н. Гурницька). In such cases, the marker of doubt is the clarifying particles used as a deixis, which denotes exactly that part of reality that is defined by the subject as incomplete. Interrogative sentences with prepositive particles *невже* and *хіба* express negative prognosticity, characterizing the previously proposed situation as irreal: *Невже вони можуть бабахнути? — засумнівався Гоша.* (Ю. Єрмолаєв). The peculiarity of the representative of doubt is its close functional and syntactic connection with the qualifiers of various parts of speech, which indicate a certain part of reality, which the subject of speech characterizes as unreliable, irreal according to its qualitative, quantitative and other characteristics: *Невже ж тобі так не вподобалися вірші, Крякво?* (І. Кочерга), *Невже це так просто?* (О. Бердник) *Невже той самий?* (С. Жадан).

Special attention should be paid to the idiomatic combination «та яке там» in the Ukrainian language, that depending on the linguistic-pragmatic situation, can express both doubt and denial; since it can be used both independently to express doubt: *Та яке там... — він востаннє все зважив і пішов ва-банк* (І. Павлюк), as well as with an adjunct denoting a certain aspect of reality that causes doubt in the subject of speech: *Та яке там ягнятко: цілий баран... Павич! Та який страшний!* (П. Гнененко). *Та яке там «здалося», коли по ночах під моїми вікнами бовваніють якісь темні фігури* (П. Тичина). In the second case, as can be seen from the example, the situation of doubt requires an urgent solution from the subject, that is, the irreal *яке там здалося* = real *не здалося*, which is expressed at the level of clarifications or coherent sentences that explain objective reality. Because doubt is an emotion that provokes the subject to create an irreal, hypothetical model of reality or define the existing reality as irreal. A peculiarity of doubt at the communicative-pragmatic level is the need to determine «objective» reality, that is, the destruction of the «real/irreal» opposition that arose as a result of doubt. Analyzing the central and peripheral linguistic ways of representing doubt, we came to the conclusion that some stable lexical and syntactic expressions involve both the formation of such an opposition and its subsequent leveling within one sentence.

It is in these two varieties that the general opposition of «real» and «irreal» is preserved, although in certain cases the oppositional opinion expressed by doubt refers to another hypothetical assumption: — *Вгадав, князю, — відказав Леміш. — Сам бачиш, що мої хлопці йдуть пішки. То я за кожну з цих гарб хочу отримати для них бодай по одному коневі. — Хотів би побачити, як тобі це вдасться, — засумнівався Глинський* (В. Рутківський). The opposition of «real» and «irreal» is expressed using the appropriate tense of verbs, particles and other system-functional markers of irreality.

The third semantic category of irreal meaning, where representatives of doubt are found, is the category of evidentiality. Some researchers, for example, O. L. Dotsenko, referring to the paradigm of formal-logical studies of modality, define evidential semantics as the main one for doubt as one of the communicative situations of expressing irreal meanings. So, from this point of view, doubt is defined as a corpus of non-performative statements, the purpose of which is to indicate the complete or partial incorrectness of someone else's statement by the speaker; the linguopragmatic feature of which is «the presence of antonymic connections with sentences of knowledge and synonymous connections with constructions of relative subordination (including indirect interrogative sentences)»: *я сумніваюся у тому, що...не думаю, що... не можу сказати, щоб...* (Dotsenko, 2006, p. 51).

However, this approach is too narrow and focuses attention only on the opposition «truth/untruth», which conveys only one of the properties of the semantic category of irreality as a linguopragmatic phenomenon. Nevertheless, an affirmative statement directed at the source of

information is one of the most widespread varieties of the linguistic situation of doubt and deserves a separate detailed consideration.

The central representative of evidentiality, which introduces an irreal meaning, is the part hardly/unlikely in sentences constructed as a sequentially logical representation of objective reality: *Я розповідаю тобі про те, що **навряд** ти знайшов би в матеріалах вашої "Зета-люкс" (О. Тесленко).* In this case, only this part indicates the expression of doubt and the positive nature of the entire statement; and can be used as an indirect negation. A combination of these particles with a conditional method is also common: ***Навряд чи** в ній закопано парашут; траву й квіти ніде не прим'ято, майор неодмінно **побачив би** людські сліди, – та й чого диверсантові виходити на відкрите місце? (Р. Самбук),* which is used to simultaneously simulate an irreal situation and deny it as unreliable and not belonging to reality: *Та тільки **ні**, – провадив далі титар, – **навряд чи** він заїде: хіба мало в нього своїх справ? (М. Старицький).*

Thus, when expressing evidentiality as one of the meanings of irrealty, such lexemes denoting doubt appear as expressions of evidential irrealty. Doubt appears as one of the elements of the logical analysis of reality and is often characterized by the denial of certain conclusions that arise as a result of this analysis. A feature of this type of irreal meaning is the possibility of self-denial, which some researchers define as "self-destructive reflection" of the subject of speech (Pietrandrea, 2012, p. 137). A clear example is complex syntagms with parcellation, where doubt is represented by interrogative sentences indicating a certain sign of reality: *Хто його вбив? Кримінальники? Сумнівно. Підрозділ Ордену? Його не могли вбити без дозволу Коммодора. (В. Єшкілев).* In this case, the logical and consistent reasoning of the subject is aimed at rejecting a number of hypothetical situations; and doubt here acts as an intellectual productive impulse. In the structure of the interaction, there is also a way of representing doubt through a partial repetition of the previous statement in order to negate it: *Жодного **витоку** назовні. – **Жодного витоку?** Сумнівно, брате, сумнівно... (В. Єшкілев).*

In works on irreal meanings, the direct expression of doubt through a performative verb in the corresponding explicit expression of the subject of doubt «*Я сумніваюся, що...*» with further explanation is defined as belonging to the category of "problematic credibility" (Dotsenko, 2006, p. 256). This category also includes the expression of doubt due to a similar syntactic construction with the adverb *Я **невпевнений**, що...* . From the semantic point of view, these two constructions represent an equivalent meaning, however, the use of an adjective allows the subject of communication to define as irreal/unlikely not so much the situation itself, but the ability to correctly assess it.

Expressing the semantics of doubt with the help of interrogative sentences that begin with the constant combination of the particles *а* and *раптом* is characterized by syncreticity with the semantics of probability, since it mainly depicts a specific hypothetical situation, equal to similar ones: *А **раптом** двірничиха бачила її або іще хтось? (Л. Кашин).* The following judgment conveys the semantics of doubt, the interrogative sentence is characterized by the presence of a negative expression and an affirmative character in relation to prepositive expressions, as well as other situational linguistic markers of evidentiality: *А **раптом** мій сон – то так, просто наснилося і **ніяка не правда?** (Н. Ягоджинська).* In this case, the subject of speech models a full-fledged hypothetical situation, which completely or partially denies the existing objective-logical signs of reality or the previous situation.

Such syncretism allows us to attribute this permanent syntactic representation of doubt to the prognostic-evidentiary meaning of irrealty. This type of expression of doubt is also characterized by hyperbolization or simulation of an absurd hypothetical situation, since one of the markers of doubt as a specific communicative act is a high emotional component: *І спочатку страждала, переживала – як він до мене ставиться, чому ми нечасто зустрічаємося, як мені бути, **а раптом** я*

йому зовсім не подобаюся... (О. Льченко). In this case, the model to express irrealty is based on the subject's selection of only a certain sign of reality while ignoring others.

4. CONCLUSIONS

As a result of the conducted research, we determined the main meanings of irrealty, which are realized with the help of the main representatives of doubt in the Ukrainian language: prognosticity, counterfactuality, evidentiality, as well as certain specific meanings of a deontic-evidential and prognostic-evidential nature, which are associated with the specificity of the expression of doubt and its syncretic nature. Hence, it may be assumed that doubt as a modus category is assigned exclusively to the evidential meaning of irrealty, significantly narrows the real semantic potential of this modus category. Doubt is represented as an intellectual-emotional impulse, which is not only related to the subjective analysis of the prepositive situation by the communicator from the point of view of its correspondence to reality or irrealty but is also the impetus for the formation of the basic opposition of the real and the irreal, which was not previously observed. A high degree of emotional component in the communicative situation of doubt leads to the formation of «auto reflective destruction», where the subject of speech deliberately models hyperbolized irreal situations that contradict both reality and his subjective attitude towards it. The irreal meanings defined by us are approximate and limited, which allows us to expand the typology in further research, by reminding it of larger semantic subcategories of irrealty, and to expand the view existing in modern linguistics both on this category and on representatives of irrealty in the contemporary Ukrainian language.

REFERENCES

- [1] Dotsenko, O. L. (2006). Semantic-pragmatic syntax: modality expression peculiarities: a monograph. Milenium, 226 p. <https://cutt.ly/j3FzjsR> (in Ukr.)
- [2] Krasnenko, O. M. (2013). Modal means of expression of possibility, probability, necessity and doubt (on the material of French texts on international relations). *Scientific Journal of Lesia Ukrainka East-European National University. Series: Philological Sciences*, 19, 175–180. <https://evnuir.vnu.edu.ua/bitstream/123456789/8074/1/41.pdf> (in Ukr.)
- [3] Kharyton, L. (2010). *Peculiarities of the frame DOUBT*. Liudmyla Kharyton (Eds.). Language. Culture. Communication: Materials of the I International scientific conference, Chernihiv: T. Shevchenko Chernivtsi National Pedagogical University. P. 136–138. (in Ukr.)
- [4] Pietrandrea, P. (2012). The conceptual structure of irrealty. A focus on non-exclusion-of-factuality as a conceptual and a linguistic category. *Language Sciences*. 34(2), 184-199. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.langsci.2011.08.004>

Nataliya Magas, Associate Professor, Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages of Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National, Ivano-Frankivsk, Ukraine.

ORCID ID: 0000-0003-4496-9262

Address: Nataliya Magas, Vasyl Stefanyk Precarpathian National University, 57 Shevchenko St., Ivano-Frankivsk, 76025 Ukraine.

E-mail: natussiam@gmail.com

Received: April 29, 2022; **revised:** May 1, 2022.

Магас Наталія. Семантичний потенціал репрезентативів сумніву у вираженні ірреальних значень. *Журнал Прикарпатського університету імені Василя Стефаника*, 9 (2) (2022), 71–78.

У дослідженні розглядаються способи вираження сумніву як одного з комунікативних актів у кореляції з опозицією реальності та ірреальності в українській мові. У лінгвістичних розвідках вивчення сумніву та його репрезентантів займають периферійне місце у вивченні модальності, найчастіше розглядаючись у компаративних роботах, не зважаючи на те, що інтегральні засоби його репрезентації являються водночас показниками ірреалісу на лексичному, синтаксичному та прагматичному рівнях. Це передусім пояснюється семантичною дифузністю та синсематичністю вираження сумніву в українській мові, що впливає і на складність типологізації його репрезентантів у структурі семантичної категорії ірреальності. Сумнів як синкретичний емоційний та евіденційний модусний компонент, з одного боку, постає інтелектуальним пошуковим імпульсом, що призводить до верифікації суб'єктом певної екстралінгвістичної ситуації залежно від її відповідності реальному чи ірреальному, що дозволяє розглядати її в площині евіденційної семантики; з іншого боку, розгалужені способи репрезентації сумніву та їх аспектуальні характеристики вказують на їх потенціал у вираженні інших ірреальних значень в конкретних випадках.

Ключові слова: категорія ірреальності/реальності, модальність, евіденційність, ірреаліс.