



IJTIMOIIY-GUMANITAR SOHADA ILMIY-INNOVATSION TADQIQOTLAR

ILMIY METODIK JURNALI

ISSN 3060-5059



VOL.3 № 4

2026

INGLIZ TILIDA GAP DARAJASIDAGI RAVISHLARNING KOGNITIV-PRAGMATIK TALQINI

Qo'ldashev Akram Makhmudovich

O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti, professor (DSc)

Bozorbayeva Sarvinoz Ilxom qizi

O'zbekiston davlat jahon tillari universiteti, magistrant

Annotatsiya

Ushbu maqolada ingliz tilidagi gap darajasidagi ravishlar kognitiv-pragmatik nuqtayi nazardan tahlil qilinadi. Tadqiqot vakillik xususiyatiga ega misollarni sifat jihatdan talqin qilish va asosiy grammatik hamda lingvistik tadqiqotlarda keltirilgan nazariy tavsiflar bilan cheklanadi. Usul ravishlaridan farqli o'laroq, gap darajasidagi ravishlar butun gap doirasiga ta'sir qiladi hamda odatda epistemik munosabat, baholash yoki diskurs aloqalarini ifodalaydi. Maqolaning maqsadi ularning lingvistik maqomini aniqlashtirish, asosiy semantik-pragmatik turlarini belgilash va nutq egasiga xos ma'no yaratishdagi rolini tushuntirishdan iborat. Tahlil shuni ko'rsatadiki, *probably, certainly, fortunately, frankly, however* kabi birliklar oddiy usul ravishlari emas, balki interpretativ operatorlar sifatida talqin qilinishi mumkin. Tadqiqot umumlashtirilgan korpus xulosalarini bermaydi, balki ushbu ravishlarning berilgan misollar va nazariy tavsiflar doirasida qanday ishlashini izohlaydi.

Kalit so'zlar: gap darajasidagi ravishlar, kognitiv-pragmatik talqin, epistemik ma'no, baholovchi ma'no, nutq egasining pozitsiyasi, diskurs tashkiloti, ingliz tilshunosligi.

КОГНИТИВНО-ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКАЯ ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИЯ ПРЕДЛОЖЕНЧЕСКИХ НАРЕЧИЙ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

Кулдашев Акрам Махмудович

Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков, профессор (DSc)

Бозорбаева Сарвinoз Илхом кизи

Узбекский государственный университет мировых языков, магистрант

Аннотация

В статье рассматриваются предложенческие наречия в английском языке с когнитивно-прагматической точки зрения. Исследование ограничивается качественной интерпретацией репрезентативных примеров и теоретическими описаниями, представленными в основных грамматических и лингвистических работах. В отличие от наречий образа действия, предложенческие наречия распространяются на всё предложение и обычно выражают эпистемическую позицию, оценку или дискурсивные отношения. Цель статьи — уточнить их лингвистический статус, определить основные семантико-прагматические типы и объяснить их вклад в формирование субъективно-ориентированного значения. Анализ показывает, что такие единицы, как *probably, certainly, fortunately, frankly, however*, следует рассматривать не как простые модификаторы, а как интерпретирующие операторы. Исследование не претендует на корпусные обобщения, а предлагает теоретически обоснованное объяснение функционирования этих наречий в рассматриваемых примерах и описаниях.

Ключевые слова: предложенческие наречия, когнитивно-прагматическая интерпретация, эпистемическое значение, оценочное значение, позиция говорящего, организация дискурса, английское языкознание.

A COGNITIVE-PRAGMATIC INTERPRETATION OF SENTENTIAL ADVERBS IN

ENGLISH

Qoldashev Akram Makhmudovich

Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Professor (DSc)

Bozorbayeva Sarvinoz Ilkhom qizi

Uzbekistan State World Languages University, Master Student

Abstract

This article examines sentential adverbs in English from a cognitive-pragmatic perspective. The discussion is limited to a qualitative interpretation of representative examples and to the theoretical descriptions found in major grammatical and linguistic studies. Unlike manner adverbs, sentential adverbs have scope over the clause as a whole and typically signal epistemic stance, evaluation, or discourse relation. The article aims to clarify their linguistic status, outline their main semantic-pragmatic types, and explain how they contribute to speaker-oriented meaning. The analysis suggests that items such as *probably*, *certainly*, *fortunately*, *frankly*, and *however* can be described as interpretive operators rather than simple manner modifiers. The study does not claim corpus-wide generalization; instead, it offers a theoretically grounded account of how these adverbs function in the examples and descriptions considered here.

Keywords: sentential adverbs, cognitive-pragmatic interpretation, epistemic meaning, evaluative meaning, speaker stance, discourse organization, English linguistics.

In modern linguistics, adverbs are no longer treated as a fully homogeneous grammatical class [9; 438–450 p.]. Reference grammars show that adverbials differ in form, semantic scope, and communicative function, and some of them affect the interpretation of the whole clause rather than the manner of the event described [2; 575–580 p.]. This observation is especially important for the study of sentence-level meaning because it shifts attention from the verb phrase to the speaker's interpretation of the proposition.

Within this broader class, sentential adverbs such as *probably*, *certainly*, *perhaps*, *fortunately*, *frankly*, and *however* are frequently discussed as units that add an interpretive layer to the utterance [3; 180–199 p.]. They do not simply answer questions like *how?* or *when?*; instead, they indicate how the proposition should be understood in terms of certainty, evaluation, or discourse relation. Thus, the contrast between *He will come* and *He will probably come* reflects not only lexical variation but also a change in epistemic commitment.

A cognitive-pragmatic approach is useful here because it allows the researcher to relate grammatical form to conceptualization and communicative intention. In this perspective, grammar is connected with meaning construction, while pragmatic analysis explains how speakers position themselves toward what they say and toward their addressee [6; 120–140 p.]. The present article therefore focuses on how sentential adverbs contribute to speaker-oriented meaning in English.

The aim of the article is modest and clearly delimited: to clarify the linguistic status of sentential adverbs, to group their main semantic-pragmatic types, and to explain their interpretive role on the basis of representative examples and established grammatical descriptions. The article does not attempt a corpus-based statistical generalization; rather, it offers a theoretically grounded qualitative account.

METHODS

The study combines descriptive, semantic, pragmatic, and cognitive analysis. The descriptive method is used to distinguish sentential adverbs from predicate-level and manner adverbs. The semantic method helps identify their major meanings, especially epistemic, evaluative, and discourse-organizing ones [4; 47–58 p.]. The pragmatic perspective is used to explain how these adverbs signal attitude, degree of commitment, and discourse orientation, while the cognitive perspective helps interpret them as part of meaning construal rather than as purely

formal additions.

The empirical material consists of representative English examples recurrently discussed in major grammars and linguistic studies, including sentences such as *Probably, he will come tomorrow*; *Certainly, this is true*; *Unfortunately, they failed*; *Frankly, I do not agree*; and *However, the evidence remains weak*. These examples are treated as illustrative rather than exhaustive. This limitation is important because the article aims at conceptual clarification, not at quantitative coverage of all possible contexts.

Methodologically, the article proceeds from description to interpretation. First, it outlines the distinction between clause-level and predicate-level modification. Second, it groups sentential adverbs into broad functional types. Third, it explains how those types operate in the selected examples. Such a procedure makes it possible to avoid unsupported generalizations while still providing a coherent theoretical account of the phenomenon.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The analysis suggests that the examples considered in this article can be grouped into three broad types: epistemic, evaluative, and discourse-oriented. This classification should be understood as an analytical convenience based on the literature and on the examples under discussion, not as a rigid taxonomy covering every possible borderline case.

Epistemic sentential adverbs include units such as *probably*, *perhaps*, *certainly*, and *surely*. In the examples considered here, these items modify the proposition as a whole and indicate the speaker's degree of certainty or probability. This interpretation is consistent with accounts that relate such adverbs to modality and propositional assessment [3; 180–199 p.]. The difference between *He answered the question* and *He probably answered the question* therefore lies not in the event itself but in the speaker's presentation of that event as more or less certain.

Evaluative sentential adverbs include items such as *fortunately*, *unfortunately*, *sadly*, and *surprisingly*. In the sentence *Unfortunately, they lost the case*, the adverb does not describe the manner of losing; instead, it frames the entire event through the speaker's evaluative stance. The contrast between *He resigned*, *Fortunately, he resigned*, and *Unfortunately, he resigned* demonstrates that the factual core of the proposition can remain stable while the interpretive frame changes. In this sense, evaluation is added at the clause level rather than within the predicate.

Discourse-oriented sentential adverbs include items such as *however*, *therefore*, *moreover*, *frankly*, and *honestly*. In the examples considered, *however* introduces a relation of contrast, while *frankly* signals how the following utterance should be interpreted interpersonally. Their importance lies in the fact that they help organize discourse and orient interpretation, not merely add lexical detail. This supports the view that sentential adverbs participate in discourse management as well as clause interpretation.

A key distinction underlying the discussion is scope. Predicate adverbs modify the event or process, whereas sentential adverbs take scope over the clause as a whole [7; 22–38 p.]. The contrast between *He answered the question carefully* and *He probably answered the question* illustrates this point particularly clearly: *carefully* characterizes the manner of answering, while *probably* qualifies the proposition itself.

From a cognitive-pragmatic perspective, the selected examples show that sentential adverbs can be treated as linguistic signals of construal. They do not only report what happened; they also indicate how the speaker presents that content—as probable, certain, regrettable, contrastive, or frank. Within the limits of the present qualitative analysis, it is therefore reasonable to describe these adverbs as interpretive operators that connect grammar with speaker stance and discourse organization.

At the same time, the article avoids broader claims that would require corpus evidence. For example, it does not claim that one type of sentential adverb is always dominant in every register or that each item has identical pragmatic weight in all contexts. Such questions remain open and require separate empirical investigation.

CONCLUSION

The article has shown that sentential adverbs can be described as a distinct functional group within English adverbials when the analysis is based on semantic scope and communicative role rather than on form alone. In the material and theoretical descriptions considered here, they operate at the clause level and contribute epistemic, evaluative, or discourse-organizing meaning. The main conclusion is therefore cautious but clear: sentential adverbs are not well explained as simple manner modifiers. In the representative examples analyzed, they function as speaker-oriented devices that shape the interpretation of the proposition. A cognitive-pragmatic framework is useful for explaining this role because it links grammatical position, semantic scope, and communicative intention. Further research may test these observations on broader corpus material, across registers, or in cross-linguistic comparison. Such work would make it possible to determine how stable the proposed distinctions are beyond the theoretical and illustrative level examined in the present article.

REFERENCES

1. Biber, D., Johansson, S., Leech, G., Conrad, S., Finegan, E. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. — London: Longman, 1999.
2. Huddleston, R., Pullum, G. K. The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2002.
3. Hoyer, L. Adverbs and Modality in English. — London: Longman, 1997.
4. Jackendoff, R. Semantic Interpretation in Generative Grammar. — Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1972.
5. Langacker, R. W. Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction. — Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2008.
6. Levinson, S. C. Pragmatics. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983.
7. Nilsen, D. L. F. The Grammar of English Sentential Adverbials. — The Hague: Mouton, 1972.
8. Palmer, F. R. Mood and Modality. 2nd ed. — Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001.
9. Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., Svartvik, J. A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. — London: Longman, 1985.