

MEANING-MAKING POTENTIAL OF NON-CATEGORIC STATEMENTS IN LINGUISTIC TEXTS.

Mukhamedova Nigora,

USWLU 3rd English faculty

Teaching English methodology-3 department

Abstract

This article explores the semantic and communicative functions of non-categoric statements within linguistic texts. Unlike categoric statements that assert definite truths or facts, non-categoric utterances—such as approximations, hedges, assumptions, and modal constructions—serve to mediate meaning, reflect speaker intention, and enhance interpretative flexibility. The study analyzes how such statements contribute to the construction of nuanced meaning, authorial stance, and dialogic interaction. By examining various linguistic and discourse examples, the article demonstrates that non-categoric statements play a crucial role in shaping textual coherence, engaging the reader, and reflecting epistemic modality.

Keywords: non-categoric statements, meaning-making, epistemic modality, linguistic texts, discourse analysis, communicative strategies, semantic nuance, authorial stance.

The thought schemes, on the basis of which the units of language and speech are built, have a direct relation to their content and their form. Syntactic constructions corresponding to different thought schemes reflect the peculiarities of these thought schemes, for example, in the sense that certain semantic categories can be expressed explicitly - directly or indirectly, or implicitly. The object of linguistic research of scientific texts can be the study of system-structural variation of different-level means of expression, identification of differences between them in a given speech situation and their textual functions, up to rhetorical, as well as the classification of semantic types of sentences and





constructions used in them. Variation of means and ways of nomination and syntactic organization of the statement is always important for the meaning of the text. In this respect, language units that are system-structural variants are of interest as a means of semantic differentiation of the content plan of scientific texts. Texts related to scientific speech demonstrate a certain number of both substantive and formal features, on the basis of which their system description is possible. It is established that the way of displaying the thought content reported in an utterance is determined by the intents of the speaking/writing subject. V. Croft noted, for example, the following peculiarity. The main cognitive and pragmatic difference between affirmative statements is that once the author wants to simply express some propositional content, in another case he wants to characterize it as a certain fact or event. Depending on this, certain modal words or particles may or may not appear in the statement [Croft, 2000]. The examples show that the explicit marking of cognitive and pragmatic moduses of the believer is possible due to the formation of various syntactic constructions. Let us compare:

- (1) *He knows about it;*
- (2) *He does know about it;*
- (3) *To my mind, he knows about it*
- (4) *He seems to know about it.*

The formation of the construction (2) contributes to the appearance of the element of does in the statement, which in (2) can create a communicative-pragmatic effect of emphatization, strengthening the impacting force of the utterance. The formation of the construction with the parenthesis That mind allows the author to express his attitude to what is reported in the form of author's commentary. The formation of the construction (4) contributes to the appearance of the verb seems in (4), which indicates that the author wants to get rid of the categorical confirmation of the truth of the reported. This element contributes not to the increase, but to the decrease or weakening of the impacting force of the statement. The formation of such constructions opens the positions occupied by



modal verbs and other means of expressing subjective modality. All of them, as it can be seen when comparing examples (1) and (2), (3) and (4), allow expressing different intents and epistemic modus operandi of the addressee. These units are pragmatic and epistemic modifiers of the corresponding statements. From the cognitive point of view, the above statements are characterized by different degrees of the speaker's conviction in the truth of what is reported. Using a statement without a modal verb, but with the parenthesis That mind or. authorizing it (That mind), the addressee takes responsibility for the truth of the statement on himself; obviously, he believes that he can count on more effective persuasion if the addressee takes into account his authority. By using the modal verb seem, the addressee demonstrates a communicative-pragmatic intention to abdicate responsibility for the absolute truth of his/her utterance.

Unlike the means of functional-stylistic orientation, modal words, conjunctions and particles are not obligatory in terms of structural-grammatical form and functional-stylistic orientation of an utterance. They are used both in spoken and spoken language, and in newspaper-publicistic and written scientific speech. Due to the lack of special means, the grammatical connection of the units marking these modus operandi with the main composition of the utterance is either weakened or cannot be established. Here it is important to note that since the images activated by different linguistic forms of utterances are different, hence, their meanings are also different [Langacker, 1976].

The list of used literature:

1. Croft, W. A conceptual framework for grammatical categories (or, a taxonomy of prepositional acts) [Text] / W. Croft // Journal of Semantics. - 1990. - № 7.-P. 245-279.
2. Langacker, R.W. Semantic representations and the linguistic relativity hypothesis [Text] / R.W. Langacker // Foundations of Language. - 1976. — № 14. -P. 307-357



3. Saidova M.S. "The concept of function and context within the framework of the communicative approach". Western European Journal of Historical Events and Social Science Volume 1, Issue 3, November, 2023,46-48p;