УДК 811.161.1'37

DISCOURSE WORD AS A MEANS OF EXPRESSING THE CONCEPT OF DOUBT
ДИСКУРСИВНЕ СЛОВО ЯК ВИРАЖЕННЯ КОНЦЕПТУ СУМНІВУ

Siaomen Lie/Сяомен Лє ,
graduate student / аспірантка
ORCID: 0000-0002-3060-4281
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv,
64/13, Volodymyrska Street, City of Kyiv, 01601
Київський національний університет імені Тараса Шевченка,
м. Київ, вул. Володимирська, 64/13, 01601

Abstract. In recent years the study of discourse markers has attracted more and more attention of scholars. In speech communication, discourse markers do not affect the content of sentences, but they play a very important role both in the generation and understanding of utterances and in language acquisition. The use of discourse markers is inseparable from the pragmatic awareness of the communicative subject, it not only conveys propositional meaning but also provides informational markers for discourse understanding. Doubting discourse marker is a modal discourse marker that basically denotes the uncertainty and uncertainty of the speaker regarding the expressed propositional content. As a means of expressing the concept of doubt, the article classifies discourse markers and analyzes their various semantic and pragmatic characteristics.

Key words: discursive words, discourse marker, concept of doubt, semantic characteristics, pragmatic function.

Introduction.

A discourse word is known as a discourse marker and refers not only to individual words but also to phrases and structural organizations. The term «discourse word» appeared in linguistics not so long ago. This term in linguistics was introduced in the late 1970s. Its relevance is associated with interest in science in studying the role of function words in communicative discourse. Currently, a number of studies devoted to one or another discursive word continue to appear, which indicates that modern linguistics pays great attention to the study of discursive words.

Scientists call discourse words those lexical units or structural organizations that reflect the relationships between the structural components of discourse. Linguists are conducting systematic and detailed research on this issue. Fraser and Anderson specialize in the study of the English word «even» [6]; Culioli and Bastert study the French words «bien» and «donc» [2,3].

With the development of pragmatics, discourse analysis and other related disciplines, people have become more aware of the pragmatic status and research value of discourse words. Discourse words are no longer indifferent redundant components. These are pragmatic mechanisms that help construct and understand discourse. D. Schiffrin's book «Discourse makers» is currently very popular among linguists because it is a pioneering work in the study of discourse markers [17].

In verbal communication the appearance of discourse words usually requires certain preconditions. These are the speaker, the addressee and the context, formed by two parties: the discourse in verbal communication and the context.

Discourse words that have the marker «doubt» are classified in traditional grammar as introductory words, modal words, adverbs and predicative phrases that evaluate the content of the message from the point of view of its reliability. The main discursive words are the following words: probably, i think, it seems, it seems, apparently, apparently, probably, in all likelihood, maybe, should be, visible, most likely, supposedly, like, unlikely and others. The speaker marks the cognitive state of uncertainty, lack of confidence or doubt about the correctness of the content of the expressed sentence with the help of the discourse word "doubt". This word simultaneously removes the factual presuppositions of the statement of the one who speaks.

Main text.

Let's consider the classification of «doubtful» discourse words. A propositional attitude is a subjective initiative operation of the speaker on propositions, which can also be called a subjective attitude towards propositions. A propositional attitude is the speaker's internal thinking about a proposition or reflected event or process. Among them, cognition is the core. Human cognition usually begins with perceptual knowledge, progresses through thinking, and enters the knowledge stage. Therefore, cognitive propositional attitude is divided into perceptual intention, opinion intention, cognitive intention and others. Propositional attitude is represented in utterances by propositional attitude predicates that govern the entire sentence. One of its functions is to indicate the way in which the propositions it introduces are formed (that is, the type of propositions) and the «doubtful» discourse word. It is a linguistic unit of propositional attitude, similarly related to the way propositions are formed. At the textual level, the propositional information on which the speaker's organization of an utterance depends can be expressed through a «doubtful» discourse word.

Propositional verbs of opinion can be divided into those that lead to an opinion-evaluation (for example, consider), and those that lead to an opinion-assumption (for example, think). The first leads to the assumption that the subject of a propositional attitude directly knows the object of evaluation. The latter lead to speculation about states of affairs made by the subject of a propositional attitude.Compare the following two examples:

Example 1. I haven't seen the movie, but I think it's interesting.

Example 2. I haven't seen the movie, but I think it's interesting.

Example 1 is an opinion-assumption and the subject does not have direct contact with the object. Example 2 – pure evaluation, the subject directly perceives the object. Therefore, the basis for establishing opposition here is propositional content. It is directed by the propositional attitude predicate. It is based on whether the subject of a propositional attitude has direct contact with the object of evaluation. Discourse words that express «doubt» can be classified according to whether the propositional content they mark is based on whether the subject has direct contact with the object of evaluation.

Therefore, we divide «dubious» discourse words into two categories. The first category is used to indicate the speaker's direct contact with the situation being assessed. Here the person who speaks can directly judge the propositional event. This person has personalized information without logical reasoning (for example, as if, it

seems, like). Another category is used to indicate the lack of knowledge of the situation by the person speaking. «Non-personal information does not allow a person to judge a propositional event directly (for example, probably, probably, maybe, possibly)» [26].

Let us analyze the semantic characteristics of "dubious" discourse words. Among the characteristics of discourse words, Travis identifies intonational, syntactic and semantic independence from the sentence [19].

According to Kobozev, discursive words carry information important for the correct understanding of the meaning of the text. This information is about the rhetorical structure of the text and the attitude of the speaker to what is being communicated [25].

Kibrik wrote that discourse is a communicative context, which consists of the consciousness of the communicant and the text that arises in the process of communication [24]. The general semantic property of discourse words is that their meaning is not included in the proposition, but in the intentional component of the semantic meaning. Discourse words are additions to the sentence as a whole and do not act as structural components of the sentence.

Grice developed a theory of speaker meaning. Grice wrote that discourse is not only what the subject says, but also what the subject means. These are conversational implicature and statutory implicature. The semantic function of discourse words lies in their ability to provide a connection between the meaning expressed in the utterance and the meaning intended by the speaker. Discursive words are oriented toward an interpersonal function. That is, on expressive, emotive, textual (syntactic) functions. They are auxiliary units of communication [23]. Yule writes: «conversational implicature is associated with special words, and when people use these special words, they lead to additional semantics in discourse» [20]. Discourse words give «additional meaning» to the meaning of an utterance. This is called «implicit semantics». When used, different implicit semantics determine the difference between the two types of discourse words.

Let us analyze the use of «dubious» discourse words in different modal frames. The implicit meanings contained in the two types of «dubious» discourse words limit their use in sentences. According to Werzbicka, the «modal frame is determined by the type of discourse as a whole, that is, by all the constituent elements of the discourse. This is the ideological basis, modality, point of view, stereotypes and rating scales that exist in the cultural concepts of the speaker» [22]. Therefore, we can say that the modal frame is the attitude of the speaker to the utterance, which expresses the subjective content.

When a discourse word is introduced into an utterance, its meaning is integrated into the subjective content of the utterance. The implicit semantics contained in the discourse word must correspond to the intentional state. The subject's consciousness cannot be in two mutually exclusive states at the same time. Different modal frames require the use of different «doubtful» discourse words. The modal frame of perceptual propositional attitude predicates and predicates with the semantic meaning «remember» requires the use of «seems» and similar discourse words. This expresses a marker of contact with the situation being assessed. The modal predicate frame

represents the opinions of a propositional attitude and requires the use of the word «perhaps» and similar discourse words that mark a lack of contact with the situation that is being evaluated.

Let's look at examples. Example 1. «I feel empty, overwhelmed by this terrible news, by these loud sounds in the morning.It seems that gluing yourself back together piece by piece will no longer be possible. But I'm trying: for the sake of two girls, for the sake of the third - in my heart, for the sake of myself» the star shared [11].

The perceptual predicate of the propositional attitude and the verb «feel» expresses remembering. In this example, the sentences indicate that the speaker has perceptual or experienced information about a real state of affairs. This information does not require logical reasoning, but for some reason the speaker is not completely convinced by this information.

Example 2. «I was thinking, where does this come from? Who are these people who write this and sling mud? They probably don't go to the theater. Or maybe they are walking. Do they go to the cinema or not? Do they watch TV? Perhaps this is a way of self-expression? But there are other ways of self-expression that are more humanistic than hating each other. Our society, on the contrary, should support each other. In fact, we all walk under God», – said Stupka [11].

The words «thought», «probably», «maybe», «perhaps» in this sentence indicate that at the moment of speech the speaker has already made assumptions about these people in his cognitive consciousness. The speaker considers this information to be speculation rather than knowledge. That is, the probability that the speaker evaluates it as truthful exceeds 50%. The above examples of utterances indicate that in utterances the type of «doubtful» discourse words is limited to propositional attitude predicates.

If a sentence is not limited by modal boundaries, then the cognitive meaning of the sentence may be ambiguous. Try to compare these offers.

Example 1. Mom seems to be sleeping.

Example 2. Mom is probably sleeping.

Example 1 can be used when the speaker sees his mother lying on the bed with her eyes closed, and example 2 can be used when the speaker thinks that it is already 12 pm, which is the time the mother usually goes to bed.

Various words expressing doubt are used when the speaker does not have sufficient information, does not know the facts, or gives a subjective assessment of the phenomenon. It is in this context that it makes sense to use a «doubtful» discourse word.

The speaker usually expresses his intentional state using discourse words. These words may express a perceptual impression of which the person is uncertain. These words express that he is remembering or conveying inaccurate memories, expressing that the information comes from other people. Let's read the examples.

Example 1: «They've broken up before and gotten back together, but this time it seems more serious—Mia's move obviously indicates that this is more than just a fight», – says an insider [13].

Example 2. «Darling, thanks to you, I think I was able to believe in love again. And even though our life now doesn't include candy and flowers, but video

communication in signal and short "++", but I will wait for you. I'm proud and I love you», – Vitvitskaya wrote [12].

Example 3. «Then I actually don't remember much, because my condition worsened, I was already delirious .As I understand it, my liver began to fail, along with all other organs, because sepsis began. That is, an infection got through the catheter from the skin, as we were later told, staphylococcus, it seems, and I began to "move away», – the woman shared [9].

Example 4. «With the victory of the far-right party in the Netherlands. With a Russia-friendly leader who came to power in Slovakia. And given the expected surge in popularity of the far right in the next European elections, Orbán's assertion that "the winds of change are coming" seems prophetic. The victory of former President Donald Trump in the US elections next year could further undermine Western support for Kyiv» [16].

Example (1) represents what the speaker says about his intuitive feelings. Example (2) represents that the speaker is trying to verify his feelings. Example (3) represents what the speaker remembers; and the example represents that the information is taken from the knowledge of other people.

These examples indicate that discourse words like «seems» represent both the internal state of the speaker and the time of his speech. The person who speaks expresses this perception in words at the same time as he perceives it. This internal state can be explained as follows: «I don't have enough evidence to draw a conclusion, but my intuition tells me that something exists here and now, so I try to show and express it».

We know that the human cognitive process is orderly. Human cognition usually begins with perception, progresses through thinking, and reaches the stage of knowledge. Therefore, the propositional attitude is also divided into perception, opinion and knowledge.

Discourse words like «seems» are used when the speaker is in contact with the situation being assessed and has direct feelings about it. Discourse words like «probably» are used when the speaker has no contact with the situation being assessed, so they can change the contextual characteristics of the utterance.

For example, in the sentence «Father is not at home», the speaker evaluates the state of the other person as an observer. Addition to a sentence has a certain effect on semantics. The speaker is no longer the person who participates in this situation, but only a subject of opinions who expresses his own opinion based on certain reasoning. The context at this time is no longer the context that the speaker perceives, but the context in which his mental activity occurs.In sentences containing the word «probably», such discourse words are not related to the situation. Thus, in sentences with concrete referents, the speaker is limited by the speech context and cannot understand the immediate information. The speaker can only use discursive words like "probably" to describe the state of others. Words of the discursive type «seems» can describe the own state of the person who is speaking. For example:

Example 1. «You probably already guess that this is the most extreme way to cool tea or simply dilute boiled water. Water from reservoirs may contain pathogenic bacteria, even if it appears clean. The most dangerous water comes from stagnant

bodies of water – lakes, ponds, and reservoirs. The water in rivers and streams is cleaner, but we do not recommend drinking it either» [1].

Example 2: «I really miss the past and their family. I often imagine how we will meet after the victory. It seems to me that I will hug him for a very long time, and then Elena», – the presenter summed up» [7].

In example 1, the speaker does not know whether the addressee knows "a way to cool the tea", but only makes a guess based on the information available. In example 2, the expression "hugging him for a long time" refers to the speaker's own experience, so the choice of words in these two sentences is different.

Cognitive linguistic markers are associated with the referential status of sentences. We know that pronouns with the particle «-to» emphasize the stability of what they refer to in the real world. But the speaker cannot acknowledge this object.The referents of pronouns with the particle «–» are not fixed and can appear in hypothetical or possible realities. Thus, discursive words like «it seems» are adapted to pronouns with the particle «-that». Discourse words like «probably» can be used in the context to which they both refer.

Let's look at a few examples. Example 1. «For some reason, he didn't invite me to this particular session; he probably felt sorry for me, as well as for his two other friends. But, probably, this Mushka got him», – he said» [4].

Example 2. «But it fell into place, so it's not so bad. In some Germany, probably, the passengers would have been frightened by surprise and walked on foot, but here they "helped the driver put the doors on and drove on». We are proud!» wrote Kirill Bondarenko» [18].

Example 3. «In one of these videos, he talks about the often forgotten use of an inactive button on a seat belt, which seems pointless to some» [15].

Let us analyze the pragmatic function of «doubtful» discourse words. The use of discursive words is inseparable from the pragmatic awareness of the communicative subject. Awareness does not convey propositional meaning, but rather provides informational markers for understanding discourse. «Doubtful» discourse words have rich pragmatic functions in speech communication and carry rich pragmatic information.

«Doubtful» discourse words denote different speech acts. From a speech act perspective, these two types of discourse words denote different speech acts. Bulygina and Shmelev propose to distinguish hypothetical utterances that specifically express hypothetical speech acts [21]. Such a discourse word «probably» can be used as indicator words for hypothetical speech acts. The discourse word "seems" means «quasi-informative» speech acts (quasi-messages).The condition for the success of a hypothetical speech act is that the speaker does not know the real state of affairs and puts forward a hypothesis that helps the addressee clearly see the possibility of his hypothesis. The perlocutionary effects of this speech act can be different. If the addressee does not know the truth of the situation, then he has the right to choose to believe it or not, he will pay attention to this possibility and consider it further. If the addressee knows whether the situation is true, then, according to the principle of cooperation, he can express his approval or disapproval, express objections or refute it.

In the latter case, the expected perlocutionary effect of a hypothetical utterance is already the same as that of an interrogative act. Therefore, writing sometimes contains question marks at the end of such sentences, but they cannot be considered real interrogative sentences.

In addition to the function of conveying information or verifying and confirming information, hypothetical sentences with words such as «probably», «may be» indirectly express imperative illocutionary force. For example: «Maybe we can go for a walk?.» The illocutionary force of this sentence is imperative, which is equivalent to the sentence: «Let's go for a walk». We know that the use of the form of interrogative sentences to implement imperative speech acts (requests, advice, proposals) in language is normative. These forms require the participation of negative words [21]. For example: «Could you go get some bread?». The absence of negative words in the sentence «Maybe we can go for a walk?» demonstrates that what is used here is not an interrogative statement, but a hypothetical statement with discourse marker words «maybe». This type of imperative sentence reflects the speaker's cautious attitude. There is a certain degree of maneuver when expressing euphemistic requests and suggestions. Even if the other party refuses, this will not put the other party in an awkward position. For example: «Have you talked to the president about this? Perhaps he expressed a wish that it would be appropriate to send subpoenas in electronic format?» [5].

Discursive words like «seems» can be used as indicator words of "quasi-messages" of speech acts [21]. For the effective implementation of a «quasi-message», a speech act must meet several conditions: the speaker has grounds for the truth of the statement; the speaker believes that the proposition stated is true and correct.Behavior is considered as a statement of the real state of affairs [27]. When the speaker believes that the reasons or grounds for the truth of a judgment are not entirely sufficient and is not sure of the authenticity and correctness of the judgment, he adds discursive words to the content that denote personalized information. This is used to convey uncertainty to the recipient. We call such utterances «quasi-messages» of speech acts.

In the «quasi-message» of a speech act, two types of propositional content are distinguished: 1) derived by the speaker on the basis of his own feelings and experiences, which are not necessarily reliable, 2) the speaker's information comes from others.

Let's look at a few examples. Example 1. «And the most important thing, it seems to me, is his confidence that he must lead our country to victory and see peace come» [14].

Example 2. «Evil jokes always point out some kind of shortcomings or mistakes of a person. The joker does not spare the feeling of the victim. He thinks it's funny. And those around them don't want to object, because they are afraid that they will make the same joke on them» [8].

All sentences in example 1 are based on the speaker's own experience and knowledge. In example 2, the speaker uses the discourse word «seems» to express the psychological state of the joker, indicating that the speaker himself is not entirely sure of the reliability of the information.

Summary and conclusions.

Let's summarize our article. In a speech act, a doubtful discourse word is a modal discourse word. It denotes the speaker's uncertainty and doubt about the content of the statement. Discursive words of doubt do not affect the content of the statement. These linguistic units play a very important role in the production, understanding of utterances and in language acquisition.

Literature:

1. About boiled water. URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/science-life/_mozhno-li-smeshivat-kipyachenuyu-vodu-s-syroj/1171125

2. Bastert U. Modalpartikel und Lexikographie: eine exemplarische Studie zur Darstellbarkeit von DOCH im einsprachigen Wörterbuch. URL: https://catalog.lib.msu.edu/Record/folio.in00000715702

3. Culioli A. Valeurs modales et opérations énonciatives. URL: https://www.persee.fr/doc/drlav_0754-9296_1984_num_30_1_1000

4. Deputy Kereskov. URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/np/_byvshij-glava-kereckov-rasskazal-pochemu-deputat-vzorval-granaty -v-selsovete-na-zakarpate/1165627

5. Electronic summons. URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/politics/_v-pravitelstve-prokommentirovali-budut-li-povestki-v-diya/117 2352

6. Fraser B. An approach to discourse markers. URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/037821669090096V

7. Godmather of the President. URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/celebrities/_kuma-zelenskogo-otvetila-obschaetsya-li-s-prezidentom-vo- vremya-vojny/1171187

8. How to react to bad jokes. URL:https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/he-and-she/_nikogda-ne-smejtes-v-otvet-kak-reagirovat-na-zlye-shutki/1 171945

9. Interview with Ekaterina Tishkevich. URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/celebrities/_ekaterina-tishkevich-shokirovala-pochemu-vpala-v-komu/11 68369

10. Interview with Liliya Rebrik. URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/celebrities/_v-tretij-raz-beremennaya-liliya-rebrik-na-redkom-foto-poka zala-roditelej-i-pozhalovalas-na-samochuvstvie/1167537

11. Interview with Ostap Stupka. URL:https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/celebrities/_ostap-stupka-ne-schitaet-sebya-vinovnym-v-pyanom-dtp-i-n e-ponimaet-pochemu-ego-kritikuyut/1160245

12. Interview with Vitvitskaya. URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/celebrities/_veduschaya-vitvickaya-vpervye-posle-razvoda-vylozhila-fot o-s-parnemvoennym/1172961

13. Interview. URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/celebrities/_syn-bekhemov-razoshelsya-s-devushkoj-posle-pyati-let-otno shenij-smi/1172971

14. News for December 4, 2023 URL: https://gazeta.ua/search?q=%D0%BA%D0%B0%D0%B6%D0%B5%D1%82%D1%81%D1%8F&l ang=ru&p=13

15. News for January 16, 2024.

URL: https://gazeta.ua/search?q=%D0%BA%D0%B0%D0%B6%D0%B5%D1%82%D1%81%D1%8F&l ang=ru&p=6

16. Orban. URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/world-life/_ispytanie-dlya-es-stal-li-orban-drugom-putina-chto-pishut- mirovye-smi/1165388

17. Schiffrin D. Discourse markers. URL: https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3101192

18. Severe people of Kiev. URL: https://znaj.ua/ru/capital/surovye-kyevlyane-samy-pochynyly-marshrutku-y-poehaly-dalshe-foto

19. Travis C. The Natural Semantic Metalanguage approach to discourse markers URL:

https://scholar.google.com.au/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=16a2H4wAAAAJ&citation_for_view=16a2H4wAAAAJ:zYLM7Y9cAGgC

20. Yule G. Pragmatics. URL: https://ru.scribd.com/doc/11637500/Yule-George-Pragmatics

21. Булыгина Т., Шмелев А. Языковая концептуализация мира. URL: https://biblioclub.ru/index.php?page=book_red&id=211127&razdel=65

22. Вежбицкая А. Язык. Культура. Познание. URL: https://platona.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/analiticheskaja_filosofija/vezhbickaja_a_jazyk_kultura_poznanie/28-1-0-192

23. Грайс Г. Логика и речевое общение. URL: https://kant.narod.ru › grice

24. Кибрик А. Очерки по общим и прикладным вопросам языкознания. URL: https://danefae.org/djvu/kibrik92/

25. Кобозева И. Проблемы описания частиц в исследованиях 80-х годов. https://books.google.es/books/about/%D0%9F%D1%80%D0%B0%D0%B3%D0%BC%D0%B0%D1%82%D0%B8%D0%BA%D0%B0_%D0%B8_%D1%81%D0%B5%D0%BC%D0%B0%D0%BD%D1%82%D0%B8%D0%BA%D0%B0.html?id=nWw0mgEACAAJ&redir_esc=y

26. Логический анализ языка. Ментальные действия. URL: https://z-lib.io/book/14185954

27. Падучева Е. Высказывание и его соотнесенность с действительностью. URL: https://b.twirpx.link/file/796844/

References:
1. About boiled water (2024). in URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/science-life/_mozhno-li-smeshivat-kipyachenuyu-vodu-s-syroj/1171125
2. Bastert U. (1985) Modalpartikel und Lexikographie: eine exemplarische Studie zur Darstellbarkeit von DOCH im einsprachigen Wörterbuch. in URL: https://catalog.lib.msu.edu/Record/folio.in00000715702
3. Culioli A. (1978). Valeurs modales et opérations énonciatives. in URL: https://www.persee.fr/doc/drlav_0754-9296_1984_num_30_1_1000
4. Deputy Kereskov (2023). in URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/np/_byvshij-glava-kereckov-rasskazal-pochemu-deputat-vzorval-granaty -v-selsovete-na-zakarpate/1165627
5. Electronic summons (2024). in URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/politics/_v-pravitelstve-prokommentirovali-budut-li-povestki-v-diya/117 2352
6. Fraser B. (1971) An approach to discourse markers. in URL: https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/abs/pii/037821669090096V
7. Godmather of the President (2024). in URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/celebrities/_kuma-

zelenskogo-otvetila-obschaetsya-li-s-prezidentom-vo- vremya-vojny/1171187

8. How to react to bad jokes (2024). in URL:https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/he-and-she/_nikogda-ne-smejtes-v-otvet-kak-reagirovat-na-zlye-shutki/1 171945

9. Interview with Ekaterina Tishkevich (2024). in URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/celebrities/_ekaterina-tishkevich-shokirovala-pochemu-vpala-v-komu/11 68369

10. Interview with Liliya Rebrik. (2024). in URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/celebrities/_v-tretij-raz-beremennaya-liliya-rebrik-na-redkom-foto-poka zala-roditelej-i-pozhalovalas-na-samochuvstvie/1167537

11. Interview with Ostap Stupka (2023). in URL:https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/celebrities/_ostap-stupka-ne-schitaet-sebya-vinovnym-v-pyanom-dtp-i-n e-ponimaet-pochemu-ego-kritikuyut/1160245

12. Interview with Vitvitskaya (2024). in URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/celebrities/_veduschaya-vitvickaya-vpervye-posle-razvoda-vylozhila-fot o-s-parnemvoennym/1172961

13. Interview (2024). in URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/celebrities/_syn-bekhemov-razoshelsya-s-devushkoj-posle-pyati-let-otno shenij-smi/1172971

14. News for December 4, 2023 (2023). in URL: https://gazeta.ua/search?q=%D0%BA%D0%B0%D0%B6%D0%B5%D1%82%D1%81%D1%8F&l ang=ru&p=13

15. News for January 16, 2024 (2024). in URL: https://gazeta.ua/search?q=%D0%BA%D0%B0%D0%B6%D0%B5%D1%8 2%D1%81%D1%8F&l ang=ru&p=6

16. Orban (2023). in URL: https://gazeta.ua/ru/articles/world-life/_ispytanie-dlya-es-stal-li-orban-drugom-putina-chto-pishut- mirovye-smi/1165388

17. Schiffrin D. Discourse markers (2024). in URL: https://www.scirp.org/reference/referencespapers?referenceid=3101192

18. Severe people of Kiev (2018). in URL: https://znaj.ua/ru/capital/surovye-kyevlyane-samy-pochynyly-marshrutku-y-poehaly-dalshe-foto

19. Travis C. (2006).The Natural Semantic Metalanguage approach to discourse markers in URL: https://scholar.google.com.au/citations?view_op=view_citation&hl=en&user=16a 2H4wAAAAJ&citation_for_view=16a2H4wAAAAJ:zYLM7Y9cAGgC

20. Yule G. (1996) Pragmatics. in URL: https://ru.scribd.com/doc/11637500/Yule-George-Pragmatics

21. Bulygina T., Shmelev A. (1996). Yazykovaya kontseptualizatsiya mira [Linguistic conceptualization of the world]. In URL: https://biblioclub.ru/index.php?page=book_red&id=211127&razdel=65

22. Vezhbitskaya A. (1996) Yazyk. Kultura. Poznaniye. [Language. Culture. Cognition.]. in URL: https://platona.net/load/knigi_po_filosofii/analiticheskaja_filosofija/vezhbickaja_a_jazyk_kultura_p oznanie/28-1-0-192

23. Grays G. (2006) Logika i rechevoye obshcheniye [Logic and verbal communication.]. in URL: https://kant.narod.ru › grice

24. Kibrik A. (2001) Ocherki po obshchim i prikladnym voprosam yazykoznaniya. [Essays on general and applied issues of linguistics.]. in URL: https://danefae.org/djvu/kibrik92/

25. Kobozeva I. (2007) Problemy opisaniya chastits v issledovaniyakh 1980-kh godov. [Problems of describing particles in research in the 1980s.]. in https://books.google.es/books/about/%D0%9F%D1%80%D0%B0%D0%B3%D0%BC %D0%B0%D1%82%D0%B8%D0%BA%D0%B0_%D0%B8_%D1%81%D0%B5%D0%BC%D0 %B0%D0%BD%D1%82%D0%B8%D0%BA.html?id=nWw0mgEACAAJ&redir_esc=y

26. Logicheskiy analiz yazyka. Mentalnyye deystviya (1993) [Logical analysis of language. Mental actions] in URL: https://z-lib.io/book/14185954

27. Paducheva E. (1985). Vyskazyvaniye i ego sootnesennost s deystvitelnostyu. [Statement and its correlation with reality.] in URL: https://b.twirpx.link/file/796844/

Анотація. *У статті проаналізовано дискурсивні слова як засоби вираження концепту «сумнів». Визначено, що вчені називають дискурсивними словами ті лексичні одиниці чи структурні організації, що відбивають відносини між структурними компонентами дискурсу. Це прагматичні механізми, які допомагають будувати та розуміти дискурс. Дискурсивні слова, які мають маркер «сумнів», класифікуються в традиційній граматиці як вставні слова, модальні слова, прислівники та предикативні звороти, що оцінюють зміст повідомлення з погляду його достовірності. У статті аналізується використання «сумнівних» дискурсивних слів у різних модальних рамках. Доведено, що використання дискурсивних слів пов'язано з прагматичним усвідомленням комунікативного суб'єкта. У мовному акті сумнівне дискурсивне слово є модальне дискурсивне слово. Воно означає невпевненість і сумнів того, хто говорить. Дискурсивні слова з концептом «сумнів» впливають зміст висловлювання.*

Ключові слова: *дискурсивні слова, дискурсивний маркер, концепт «сумнів», семантичні характеристики, прагматична функція.*