УДК 81

В.А. Лазарев

доктор филологических наук, профессор

Южный федеральный университет

г. Ростов-на-Дону, Россия

lazarev@mail.ru

Д.Я. Гордиенко

старший преподаватель

Ростовский государственный экономический университет (РИНХ)

г. Ростов-на-Дону, Россия

dinara-na-donu@mal.ru

COGNITIVE PECULIARITIES OF AUTHOR'S PRESENTING THE ARGUMENTATIVE MODEL IN THE SCIENTIFIC TEXT

[*Лазарев В.А., Гордиенко Д.Я.* Когнитивные особенности представления авторской аргументативной модели в научном тексте]

An explicit form of the proposal to accept some proposition as a starting point of reasoning is contained in the beginning of the text or a separate paragraph devoted to the more private aspect of pathogenes. In this case the author, as a rule, outlines its position regarding the issue under consideration, critically illuminates the point, actualized in surveys of other linguists. For example, indirectly presented request to accept actualized proposition as a starting point of reasoning is a more frequent phenomenon. This request may be, in particular, expressed by indirect speech act with the structure of a rhetorical question, suggesting only an affirmative answer. The segment **then** conveys the impatience of the author to express the point of view, the dissatisfaction of the author in terms of how this issue is interpreted by other specialists in this field of research.

Key words: proposition, pathogenes, argumentative model, scientific discourse, actualized, rhetorical.

The explicit form of the proposal to accept some proposition as a starting point of reasoning is contained in the beginning of the text or a separate paragraph devoted to the more private aspect of pathogenes. In this case the author, as a rule, outlines its position regarding the issue under consideration, critically illuminates the point, actualized in surveys of other linguists. Ex.: (1) *"My argument will not focus solely or primarily upon the unique grammatical properties of natural human languages, although it is clear that these exist. My argument is rather that,*

in contrast to nonhuman signal systems of communication, human natural languages are symbol systems. The evolutionary transition from signal to symbol usage, and the extrasomatic, culturally driven elaboration of symbol usage into language, account for the unique complexity of human language (including grammar). This emergent complexity, I suggest, has in the course of evolution co-opted or captured a suite of cognitive capacities that are uniquely developed (but not unique) in humans" [10, p. 217].

Indirectly presented request to accept actualized proposition as a starting point of reasoning is more frequent phenomenon. This request may be, in particular, expressed by indirect speech act with the structure of a rhetorical question, suggesting only an affirmative answer. Rhetorical question in this case is a means of specifying that the author models the implicit suggestion to the reader to accept a proposition as a starting point for subsequent discussion on the contentious issue. Thus, in examples (2)-(3) requested starting point of reasoning is used by the author of the text as an argument against the views taken by another linguist regarding the issue: (2) *"Language is the vehicle of the mind, but sometimes it is a creaking wagon. Linguist Driek van Wissen impressed that profundity upon us many years ago. But isn't it true that creaking wagons last longer? Isn't it true that language and material need to be in motion?"* [1, p. 287]; (3) *"In trying to understand the biological roots of human language, researchers have naturally tried to find its "beginnings." The regular onset timing and structure of vocal babbling - the "bababa" and other repetitive, syllabic sounds that babies produce - have led researchers to conclude that babbling represents the "beginning" of human language acquisition... But is that "babbling" determined by the development of the anatomy of the vocal tract and the mechanisms subserving the motor control of speech production?"* [8, p. 237].

In English academic discourse, softened rhetorical illocution has a question **do you remember that?** If the author asks the reader to remember some facts, it means - directly in conjunction with other textual and contextual indicators that the starting point of the reasoning is contained above. Ex.: (4) *"Do you remember that Carey discusses this range of findings with sensible perplexity based on her supposition that "the concept color is definitionally and developmentally primitive by anybody's account"? We agree. But the fact is that color terminology is hard to acquire..."* [5, p. 187].

It is obviously, in this case, that the author not only reminds the reader some information from the previous progress of scientific discourse, but also uses this information as an argument to prove his point of view. As a result, the reader is intended to bring such a conclusion, what was a priori programmed by the author of the text and which, in the opinion of the author, initially could not coincide with the author's opinion.

Language elements which actually interlock with direct legislative acts implementing illocution of suggestion to consider some textual segment as a starting point of reasoning, appear the questions **Do we agree that...?** / Can **we agree tha**t... and **Do you agree with me that.**..? In example (5), which appears as a part of the author's arguments about the level of communicative competence of mammals, which is a factor in the study of language abilities.

Question imposed by the initial element **Do we agree that**...?, is used by the author as a suggestion to the reader to consider this segment of text as a starting point of reasoning about signaling-mediated behavior: (5) *"The first two steps of this sequence do not involve communicating the organisms' intersubjective "sharing" of a referential world, but they do require orientation toward, or social referencing of a communication partner either as a source of information or as an actor whose behavior can be influenced. This level of communicative competence is probably widespread among mammals. Do we agree that it is the underpinning complex signal-also been other ideas where social behaviors? Not only communication between conspecifics, but also communication between humans and domesticated or working animals such as dogs, horses, and elephants, often seems to involve an understanding on the part of the domesticated animal that the human can both send and receive signals"* [10, p. 226].

In the example (6) the input element **Can we agree that...?**, is actualized by the author of the study in order to maintain the reader's attention to the starting point of reasoning about the ability of symbolization among the higher apes: (6) *"So, captivity mobilizes what A. N. Severtsov called "spare brain". But can we agree that the capacity for symbolization among the higher apes is manifested in the nature? We have to remember about old parallel between the culture and captivity..."* [4, p. 38].

The segment **then** conveys the impatience of the author to express his point of view, the dissatisfaction of the author in terms of how this issue is interpreted by

other specialists in this field of research. Such connotative load of segment **then** is discovered as in propositional part of the separation rhetorical question, and in the second part of the complex question of approval imposed by the **if**.

In the latter case, the analyzed segment also implements a function to clarify that the content of the second part of the question with the structure of a complex sentence is a consequence of what is stated or implicitly implied in the first part. In (7) a rhetorical question that includes **then**, expresses the dissatisfaction of the author regarding the problem in modern linguistics. In (8) – (9) a rhetorical question is actualized, in which **then** appears as an indicator of the author's conclusions. Ex.: (7) *"Is it true that the shape of a K-II move includes not just some words spoken but also the position or office of the speaker and the context of the speaking **then**, according to modern theories?"* [6, p. 163]; (8) *"If the chronological scope of this approach is compared with those of Jakob Grimm and Ferdinand de Saussure, **then** why does the reversal of the trend in the discipline become evident?"* [12, p. 204]; (9) *"If the case considered here, the observer will use the phrase "individual A sends a sign of threat to species B", **then** can it be interpreted depending on empathy either as an individual A also protects himself or its territory from species B" or as "individual A insults (challenges) individual B"?"* [7, p. 76]. When the adverb **then** is employed for expressing the author's reasoning, a rhetorical question shapes the author's point of view on the problem. In this case, the adverb demonstrates the fact that part of the statement in which it is actualized, simulates the conclusion from the information that the reader has already adopted from the preceding stroke of the text. And so he is equally called to accept the conclusion of the author without any objection. This conclusion can be regarded as the point of view of the author, and as a starting point for the reader to maintain the author's opinion. For example, (8) can be transformed into the following statement: The reversal of the trend in the discipline is not evident for it's proved by the chronological scope suggested by Jakob Grimm and Ferdinand de Saussure; (9) is transformed in such a statement, as If the case considered here, the observer will use the phrase "individual A sends a sign of threat to species B", **then** it can be interpreted depending on empathy either as an individual A also protects himself or its territory from species B" or as "individual A insults (challenges) individual B".

If the adverb **then** is employed for expression of the author's dissatisfaction with the current state of the issue under consideration in modern science, then it is

a rhetorical question also cementitiouses author's point of view: (10) *"Little is known about the use of motivated signs by apes in the wild but it is difficult to imagine that the iconic gestures used by Kubie when communicating with Zura, or those used by bonobos during copulation, would be possible unless they reflected behavior that is also used in the wild. Does the use of motivated signs by captive apes reflect* **then** *the behavior of apes in their natural habitat?"* [2, p. 81]. A rhetorical question in this case can be interpreted as an indirect form of expression of the author's opinion (for Example, in (10): The use of motivated signs by captive apes reflects **then** the behavior of apes in their natural habitat). However, it can be difficult to interpret it as an implicit suggestion to the reader to accept this proposition as the beginning of the author's reasoning on the subject. Unlike actualizations of adverb **then** in a rhetorical question, the use of the expression **after all**, or the separation question in the framework of this type of issue, as a rule, it is a means of marking a starting point of reasoning, but not the author's opinion on a specific issue. A rhetorical question with the component **after all**, by definition, is the beginning of the author's reasoning. In the separation rhetorical questions is a somewhat different matter. Let's try to explain why.

The separation questions in everyday communication and the scientific style of speech are initiated, usually for information request for information request. Ex: (11) *"Two relationships that are characteristic of most preurban societies would, when taken together, give a clear selective advantage to high language ability, wouldn't they?"(Burling, 2005: 81);* (12) *"From psycholinguistic studies, there is extensive evidence for the representation of discrete conceptual categories, isn't there?"* [11, p. 190].

In (11), the author recognizes the fact that the reader had already agreed with the information approved by the rhetorical question. Moreover, he actualizes deductive knowledge which the reader is intended to "extract" from the citation after acceptance of this information: the fact that a high communicative competence is formed in the period before the formation of cities. In (12) a similar deductive knowledge is not actualized in the cognitive mind of the reader. If take into account the context, in which the approval is used, the deductive knowledge is unclear: what factors determine the representation of discrete conceptual categories in psycholinguistic research. The author assumes that the reader is priori familiar with these studies.

But in most cases collected by us for filing a rhetorical question, followed by the separation question, still serves as a means of expressing the author's point of view. This observation sheds light on the fact that the separation question contributes to the expression in the text the author's relationship to presented facts and laws that are directly or indirectly related to the problem of the origin of language. Ex.: (13) *"It's too crazy for words that we came all this way for nothing, isn't it?"* [12, p. 209]*; (14) "In fact, we assume in the following that there is a continuity between communicative functions in animals and man and that the reference to the ecology, in which the animal / human lives, is basic for all types of communication. It is rather the high level of sophistication which makes honeybees and humans comparable, isn't it?"* [12, p. 46].

In general, a rhetorical question, which is joined by a separation question, expresses the author's point of view, if this statement is a reaction to the assertion by some linguists considers the text issues, which expresses the opposite view. For example: (14) *"The skeptic can cite the lack of art and relatively static stone toolkit - along with their eventual demise when modern humans moved into Europe - as evidence that they were just as backward and unsophisticated as the common"caveman" image portrays...But the truth is somewhere between the basic plausibility of the whole continuum is what makes the Neanderthalers such a contentious topic for paleoanthropologists, isn't it?"* [3, p. 270]. Since the statement implied by rhetorical question, implicitly denies that is reported in the previous statement and reflects a skeptical view of some linguists, a rhetorical question itself can be seen as a form of author's disagreement with these linguists, an author's negative point of view.

The component **rather** that accompanies a rhetorical question, as a rule, is also a way of marking the beginning of the author's reasoning, especially if the issue is introduced **or**. In this case, a narrative statement immediately preceding a rhetorical question expresses the author's point of view. Ex.: (15) *"The spatial nature of gesture allows far more diverse possibilities for communication and iconic pantomime than is possible with speech, or is the capacity for iconicity* **rather** *the unique leading reason to see gestures but not speech as an easy route into a language-like communication system?"* [3, p. 212]*; (16) "In one of his discussions of human language, Wittgenstein (1953: 387) remarked, 'the deep aspect of this matter readily eludes us'. We believe this remark applies to*

*placement; a feature of language that is rarely observed, because it constitutes the deep dimension of language. Is it possible to acquire full language in this cultural sense, **or** at least this opportunity is **rather** limited?"* [9, p. 57]*; (17) "Observing the imitator achieving the same goal in a more efficient way in turn might cause the model to imitate the new movement of the former imitator. Is this type of creativity based on the decoupling of ends and means or rather on mutual imitation? Still it probably plays a very important role in the evolution of culture and technique..."* [12, p. 109].

In this respect, the component **rather** performs the same function as the separation question in the examples (11) − (17). In other words, in illocutionary terms, these components act as synonyms.

R E F E R E N C E S

1. *Baldwin D.A.* The Rise of Intentional Understanding in Human Development. Amsterdam, Philadelphia, 2002.
2. *Burling R.* The Talking Ape. Hoe Language Evolved. Oxford, 2005.
3. *Fitch W.T.* The Evolution of Language. Cambridge, 2004.
4. *Kozintsev A.G.* Language Origins: New Facts and Theories // Linguistics Theoretical Problems. S. Petersburg, 2004.
5. *Landau B., Gleitman L.R.* Language and Experience: Evidence from the Blind Child. Cambridge, MA, 1985.
6. *Millikan R.G.* Language. A Biological Model. Oxford, 2005.
7. *Monich Yu.V.* Ethimology Problems and Ritual Action Semantics // Linguistics Questions. 1998. № 1.
8. *Petitto L.A.* On the Biological Foundations of Human Language // The Signs of Language Revisited: An Anthology in Honour of Ursula Bellugi and Edward Klima. Mahway, NJ., 2000.
9. *Segardahl P., Fields, W., Savage-Rumbaugh S.* Kanzi's Primal Language: The Cultural Initiation of Primates into Language. NY, 2005.
10. *Sinha Ch.* The Evolution of Language: From Signals to Symbols to Systems // Evolution of Communication Systems. A Comparative Approach. Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England, 2004.

11. *Tallerman M.* Initial Syntax and Modern Syntax: Did the Clause Evolve from the Syllable? // Language Origins. Perspective on Evolution. Oxford, 2005.

12. *Wildgen W.* The Evolution of Human Language: Scenarios, Principles, and Cultural Dynamics. Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2004.

13. *Wohlschläger A., Bekkering H.* The Role of Objects in Imitation // Mirror Neurons and the Evolution of Brain and Language. Amsterdam / Philadelphia, 2002.

October, 26, 2015