

UDC: 378.31

THE CATEGORY OF MODALITY AND VARIOUS FORMS OF ITS EXPRESSION IN THE LANGUAGE

Almatova Nazokat Abdulkhamidovna

*Teacher of department of foreign languages, faculty of agro engineering and
hydro melioration,*

Andijan Institute of Agriculture and Agro technologies,

Andijan, Uzbekistan

Abstract: The category of modality is the category of language and presents in itself the judgment concerning the reality or the statement related to its ties and phenomena. In general, modality can be defined as the speaker's attitude to the content of his statement and the relation of the content of the statement to the reality.

Key words: Modality, phonetic, objective and subjective, grammar, predicative, teachers, category.

English modality can be expressed not only by modal verbs. Modality can be expressed by different linguistic means. In actual speech all forms expressing modality work together to make the meaning clear. But in every case there is some leading form that expresses the main attitude. These forms fall into four categories: phonetic (intonation) grammatical (mood) lexico-grammatical (modal verbs) lexical (modal words and phrases). But the most important from them is the third form which includes modal verbs. It is important to take into consideration one more feature peculiar to modal verbs.

We differentiate two types of modality: objective and subjective.

Objective modality is a compulsory feature of any utterance, and one of the categories which build up a predicative unit – sentence. This type of modality expresses the attitude of utterance to the reality. Objective modality connects with the category of time and is differentiated by the feature of time certainty – uncertainty. Subjective modality expresses the attitude of the speaker to the

utterance. In contrast to the objective modality subjective one is an elective feature of the utterance. Semantic content of the subjective modality is broader than semantic content of objective modality. Semantic stem of the subjective modality makes up the conception of assessment in the broad meaning including not only logic (intellectual, rational) qualification of the utterance, but and different types of emotional (irrational) reaction.

The main purpose of this work to analyse modality expressing language means in English texts. The objects:

- To give an idea of Modality as one of the main syntactic categories;
- To pick up Modality expressing language from English texts;
- To classify the means found.

The categories have similar interrelationships and properties within each type. These uniformities allow us to abstract them, but nevertheless each type needs to be considered separately. The interactions between types must also be analyzed [6].

Quantity, or extensional modality, is the primary type of modality. And Aristotle thoroughly dealt with it .We are not consistent in our everyday use of terms like “sometimes”, “can”, “may”, “might”, “must”, and so on [7,7].

Ultimately these are semantic issues, not important to us. Though we must pointing out them. Logic simply establishes conventions for terminology, and focuses on the material issues.

Two more, temporal modality and natural modality interact intimately with quantity. Temporal and natural modality may be called “intrinsic” modalities, because they concern the properties of concrete individuals; extensional modality is comparatively “extrinsic”, in that it focuses on abstract universals. While it is true that often the copula “is” is intended in a timeless sense, we sometimes use the word with a more restrictive connotation involving temporal limits.

The temporal equivalent of what is a singular instance in extension, is a momentary occurrence. This is the unit under consideration here. When we say N is M we may mean either that N is always M, or that N is now M, or even that N is

sometimes M. This ambiguity must be taken into consideration by Logic. A possible modification of standard propositions is therefore through the factor of temporal frequency.

The most significant type of modality is called natural modality. This refers to propositions such as “N can be M”, “N cannot be M”, “N cannot-be M”, and “N must be M”, with the sense of real, out-there potential or necessity. Aristotle in his philosophical discussions recognized these relations, but he not systematically dealt with them in the framework of his logic works.

Temporal modality radically differs from such modality. We do not here merely recognize that something may be sometimes one thing and sometimes another, or always or never so and so. We tend to go a step further, and regard that there is a character intrinsic to the object which makes it able to behave in this way or that, or incapable of doing so or forced to do so. Thus, temporal and natural modalities represent distinct outlooks, which cannot be freely interchanged.

Also need to indicate two other main types of modality, the logical and the ethical. As it is previously stated, these types are each unique, and worthy of thorough treatment on their own.

Logical modality expresses the compatibility or otherwise of a proposed assumption with the general framework of our knowledge to date. Logical modality makes use of terms such as “might” (or perhaps) and “surely”(or certainly), for possibility and necessity. Remember that we defined truth and falsehood as contextual, so this definition fits in consistently.

To the extent that such an evaluation is scientific, based on rigorous process, thorough, common public knowledge, and so on, it is objective information. To the extent that thought is deficient in its methodology, such modality is subjective.

Whereas the extensional, temporal and natural types of modality may be called 'materialistic', in that they refer directly to the world out there, which is mainly material or in any case substantial, logical modality may be called 'formalistic', because it operates on a more abstract plane.

Ethical statements tacitly refer to some value to be safeguarded or pursued, and consider the compatibility or otherwise of some proposed event with that given standard. We use terms such 'may' (for permissible) and 'should' (for imperatives), to indicate ethical possibility or necessity.

Ethical modality is of course relative to standards of value. An ethical statement can in principle be judged true or false like any other.

Subjectivity comes into play here, not only in the matter of selecting basic values, but also to the extent that, in this field more than any other, factual knowledge is often very private.

Logic must, of course, eventually analyze such modality types in detail. But for our present purposes, let us note only that, in either case, the resemblance to the other types of modality is the aspect of conditionality. They are defined through the conditions for their realization. [4]

In modern English there are grammatical and lexical means of expressing modality. Grammatical means are modal verbs like must, should, ought, will/would, can/could, may/might, need. Moreover, these verbs weaken its initial value, desirability, of obligation, necessity, etc., and transmit only the relation of the speaker to the content of the assumptions in General. Modal verbs convey different shades of modality, starting with the assumption bordering on certainty and ending with the assumption in which the speaker is not sure.

Lexical means are such modal words as perhaps, maybe, probably, possibly. Many linguists say about modal words as an independent part of speech. Their syntactic function is an introductory member suggestions. In foreign linguistics this type was noted, but was not allocated in a special category. The question arises how to deal with these units, syntactic position which does not provide information regarding their morphological nature. It seems that there are two possible solutions: either they are a special modal words, or that adverbs can function along with modal words. Some foreign and Russian linguists believe that these words are adverbs, involved in the field of modal words, without ceasing to be adverbs. Other

linguists are firmly convinced that words such as perhaps, maybe, probably, possibly should include the modal group.

List of references:

1. Egamberdiyeva D.U. The account of individual features of students in the process teaching english language. International scientific journal. Economy and society. № 6(73) -s.: 2020.
2. Gulomjonova M. Introduction Of Remote Learning Technologies In Organization Of The Educational Process Of Higher School. International journal. Questions of science and education. 32(82). p.71.
3. Jenkins L. Modality in English syntax. – A.B.1964.
4. Bloch M.I. A Course in Theoretical English Grammar. – M., 2000.
5. Usmonova Sh.R. Features of using information and communication technologies in English lessons //Economy And Society. № 6(73) -S.: 2020.
6. Nosirova M.K. Formation of foreign language communicative competence of students in the framework of modular program. International scientific journal. Economy and society. № 6(73) -s.: 2020.
7. Palmer F.R. Modality and the English Modals. – Longman, London and New York, 1979.
8. N.A. Odilova. The role of The competency format for presenting the Results of professional education//Economy and society. № 6(73) -S.: 2020.
9. Natanson E.A. Oblique Moods and Modal Verbs. – M., 1968.