

## **THE MODUS CATEGORY OF APPROXIMATION IN AN INFORMATIONAL INTERVIEW IN THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE**

Modus categorization involves a person's interpretation of the results of cognition in various aspects: in terms of their conformity to a person's ideas about the order of things, his system of values, opinions and assessments, that is, interpretation within the framework of his individual conceptual system [1, p. 10].

Approximation as a proper linguistic concept has appeared in science relatively recently. It is taken from the mathematical sciences and means the replacement of certain mathematical objects with simpler and closer to the original, more well-known quantities. The word "approximation" is derived from the Latin *approximare* – "to approach" [2].

The approximation category is the category of approximation, which is realized in terms of quantity and quality [3, p. 32].

As a phenomenon, approximation in linguistics was studied from different perspectives: logical (V. Wolski), pragmatic (J. Sadok, O. Sokolovskaya), semantic

(A. Vezhbitskaya, L. Zadeh), cognitive (E. Dubovitskaya, E. Bocharova, S. Ionova, S. Sakhno, I. Shkot, S. Adamovich) [4, c. 14].

The classifications of approximators in the modern language were developed by linguists Yu. Sorokin, I. Shkot, E. Bocharova, S. Adamovich, as well as E. Dubovitskaya.

**I. Shkot** names five semantic types of approximation that exist at the text level: limiting approximation, which is characterized by random blurring the meaning of the word; exclusive approximation is the random loss of one or several senses from the semantic structure of the approximated word; additive approximation is an unexpressed indication of the interaction of the represented referent with others that are closely related; the approximators have this sense “conjugation”; comparative approximation, which consists in an unexpressed comparison of the represented referent with the surrounding objects; relating approximation which indicates a comparison of the represented referent with the meaning of the word used – the norm of initial quality [5].

**E. Dubovitskaya** points out that the category of approximation is manifested in the field of quantity and quality, and therefore distinguishes quantitative and qualitative approximation [5].

Therefore, approximation in a language is a type of functional categorization, which is a modification of the meaning of a word in the process of constructing a sentence-utterance for categorization and designation of an object of thought [4, p. 20].

In order to quantify and consider the features of using language tools for approximating an English-language informational interview, 10 interviews were analyzed. Total playing time is 62 minutes. 107 approximators were identified.

In describing the types of approximators, the classifications of I. Shkot and E. Dubovitskaya were used [5].

The table reflects the frequency of use of approximation tools for English-language informational interviews as a percentage.

*Quantitative characteristics of the approximation tools of an English-language informational interview*

<b>Approximation Tool Group</b>	<b>Quantity</b>	<b>Percentage, %</b>
Semantic types classification by I. Shkot		
Limiting approximator	69	64,5
Exclusive approximator	13	12,2
Additive approximator	1	0,9
Comparative approximator	14	13,1
Relating approximator	5	4,7
Classification by E. Dubovitskaya		
Quantitative approximator	79	73,8
Qualitative approximator	28	26,2
<b>Total</b>	<b>107</b>	<b>100</b>

Based on the data obtained during the calculation, it is obvious that the use of **limiting** and **quantitative** approximators predominates in the English-language informational interview.

Such approximators, as a rule, indicate the approximate number of any objects or phenomena, without giving an exact number. However, the degree of accuracy or approximation may vary. For example, in the statements as *I think we could win **up to** 30 **or** 40 potentially; I mean, if you look at some of the seats, **up to** 75 per cent **or** 70 per cent voted Leave* the interview participants express approximation at the lexical level, using approximately indefinite approximators in their speech, which are most often located before rounded quantitative numerals when the interviewee does not intend to name the exact number.

Also some examples were revealed where one of the interlocutors significantly eroded the boundaries of the quantity of something: *I received **a lot of** congratulations for that from people at this conference; ... people who've campaigned **for years** for Brexit...; **A lot of** bankers will be quite horrified...* or vice versa, the boundaries were almost clearly outlined by the speaker, including by absolute approximators: *... we're looking at an increase **probably of closer to** 2.5 **or** 3; ... but beneath the headline there'd be two **or** three other extracts and précis of what else Margaret Thatcher said in that case for the Conservative Party; It's **about** a quarter of a million now; It's a big moment, this – **nearly** 200 countries signing up...; Our database has got **something like** 40,000 Conservative Party members on it.* Being not completely sure of the real quantity, the communicant wants to give the closest possible number.

It should be noted that in some cases the expression of quantitative approximation is fixed **without** the **use** of an additional approximator. For example, *We had to get the balance of being totally inclusive – getting **200** countries to sign up...; We have plans over this parliament to put more money into flood defences and to protect another **300,000** people from dangerous flooding.* Therefore, it's enough to round out some quantitative data to give the statement a touch of approximation. Rounding as a means of conveying an approximate value is frequently found in the interviews. Their function is to replace the exact number, numbers in order to save time, the lack of the need for concretization.

In the interviews in English, the communicants use exclusive approximators to a lesser extent, for example: *... essentially disruption in politics at the breakup of – of the – **the kind of** monopoly of the big parties...; ... this has all been a sense that climate change is a bit soft or **a little bit of** a waste of money...* и **компаративные** аппроксиматоры: *... because a lot of them are **quite** closed off from the rest of society...; I think if Andrea Leadsom wins it will be a **slightly** different scenario; And there's other areas where we will stay **quite closely** aligned,* they transmit a **qualitative** approximation. In examples with an exclusive approximation, the interviewee may give a negative assessment, but expressed so that the statement is not regarded as aggression.

Relative approximators that express the degree of relativity of an object or phenomenon to something are much less common: ...*they're sort of treated as if they're **somehow** equal; ... in this case **relatively** late in life...*

Additive approximators are the least frequent – 1 case of its use: *Now, all of that was **probably** wrong.* Here, the interviewee avoids the categorical wording of the assessment.

It is worth mentioning that some **predicates of opinion** have been identified. They also serve as means of displaying approximation in conjunction with or without obvious approximators. Например: ***I think** we could win **up to 30 or 40** potentially; **I think** we potentially could be talking about a new party, and **I think** there are very good sound reasons for that as well.* The interviewer wants to interest the interlocutor about the information that he provides.

While selecting approximators, not a single case of their use was found in order to hide a particular fact, but only to give a less categorical assessment of reality, without resorting to an accurate description.

A typical general model is a combination of an approximator or quantitative numeral with a noun expressing an object.

The approximation in the reviewed interviews in English conveys a wide range of meanings: uncertainty, approximation, vagueness, making feedback softer and others.

#### References:

1. Болдырев, Н. Н. Роль интерпретирующей функции в формировании языковой категории / Н. Н. Болдырев // Вестн. Тамбовск. ун-та. – 2011. – № 1. – С. 9–16.
2. Арчакова, Р. А. Феномен аппроксимационной номинации субстантивных денотатов в художественном тексте [Электронный ресурс]. / Р. А. Арчакова // Журнал научных публикаций аспирантов и докторантов. – Режим доступа: <http://jurnal.org/articles/2008/fill14.html>. – Дата доступа: 09.02.2018.
3. Васильева, Л. В. Категория аппроксимации и языковые способы ее реализации в новостном дискурсе / Л. В. Васильева // Вестн. Челяб. гос. ун-та. – Филология. – 2009. – № 39. – С. 29–32.
4. Волошин, В. Г. Явление аппроксимации в языках / В. Г. Волошин // Вестн. Одесск. нац. ун-та. – Филология. – 2014. – № 4. – С. 13–21.
5. Определение лингвистического статуса категории «аппроксимация» в английском языке [Электронный ресурс]. / Проявление категории «аппроксимация» в информационно-аналитическом и таблоидном форматах британской прессы XX-XXI веков. – Режим доступа: [https://studexpo.ru/161659/angliyskiy/opredelenie\\_lingvisticheskogo\\_statusa\\_kategorii\\_approksimatsiya\\_angliyskom\\_yazyke](https://studexpo.ru/161659/angliyskiy/opredelenie_lingvisticheskogo_statusa_kategorii_approksimatsiya_angliyskom_yazyke). – Дата доступа: 04.03.2018.