

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

SOI: [1.1/TAS](#) DOI: [10.15863/TAS](#)

International Scientific Journal Theoretical & Applied Science

p-ISSN: 2308-4944 (print) e-ISSN: 2409-0085 (online)

Year: 2022 Issue: 08 Volume: 112

Published: 30.08.2022 <http://T-Science.org>

Issue

Article



Barno Alisherovna Mukhtorova

Ferghana State University
a teacher of English Language Department,
Faculty of Foreign Languages,
Ferghana city, Uzbekistan

MODALITY AS AN OBJECT OF STUDY IN LOGIC, PHILOSOPHY, AND LINGUISTICS

Abstract: The article under discussion deals with the definition of modality in linguistics from different scientific positions, as there is no consensus about this category of language. Modality is a polysemantic term, which is considered in the framework of many sciences, such as philosophy, logic, psychology, linguistics. Depending on the point of view what science considers this category, it is possible to distinguish a number of definitions that characterize modality. It should be noted that some provisions of logical-philosophical theories of modality form the conceptual basis for the study of modality in language. Therefore, understanding the logical-philosophical essence of the concept of "modality" is important for the study of this concept within linguistics.

Key words: modality, category, objective, subjective, approach, language, scientific, position, modern linguistics, logic, philosophy.

Language: English

Citation: Mukhtorova, B. A. (2022). Modality as an object of study in logic, philosophy, and linguistics. *ISJ Theoretical & Applied Science*, 08 (112), 398-401.

Soi: <http://s-o-i.org/1.1/TAS-08-112-43> **Doi:**  <https://dx.doi.org/10.15863/TAS.2022.08.112.43>

Scopus ASCC: 1203.

Introduction

The problem of modality in different languages is of particular importance at the present stage of linguistic development, since modality is a central linguistic category and has a universal character. It has aroused interest among scientists of different epochs and directions of scientific research. In modern science the term "modality" is widely used in philosophy, logic, linguistics.

Main part

The notion of modality (from Latin *modus* 'measure, method') first appeared in logic which denoted one of the most important properties of judgments: the characteristic of a judgment depending on whether it asserts the possibility, validity or necessity of something. The first studies in the field of modal logic belong to Aristotle (4th century B.C.). Aristotle referred to the separation of all "beings" into two large groups: existent in possibility and existent in reality. The scholar distinguished several types of possibility and necessity, which are conjugated with

each other. Exploring the interrelation of possible and necessary, the philosopher revealed two main types of modality: conditional modality and unconditional modality. The unconditional modality was connected with being in reality, and the conditional modality - with being in possibility. Singling out these two types of modalities is very important for linguistics, because the first one is the basis of subjective modality in language, and the second is the basis of objective modality. Thus, from those ancient times to the present day, modal logic has traditionally studied statements with the meanings of possibility, reality and necessity.

In modern domestic logic scholar A.V. Isaev similarly divides all judgments into probable and reliable ones. Credible judgments, in turn, are divided into judgments of reality, judgments of possibility, and judgments of necessity. Reality judgments represent a thing as a whole, as a set of attributes: *Pete is straight-A student*. Possibility judgments reflect the sufficiency of the ground to connect the subject with the predicate: *Pete can be a scientist*. Suppositions of

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIIHQ (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

necessity show that the sign, sufficient for the connection of the subject and predicate, belongs to the essence of the object: *The glass must have a bottom* [11, p.96].

Immanuel Kant (XVIII A.D.) had the greatest influence on the modern conception of philosophy and logic about the modality of judgments. In "Critique of Pure Reason" he distinguishes 12 "pure reasoning concepts" [12, p.174]. Such "pure reasoning concepts" I. Kant calls categories and divides them into four groups: categories of quantity, categories of quality, categories of attitude, categories of modality.

Immanuel Kant distinguishes three categories of modality: possibility - impossibility, existence - non-existence, necessity - contingency. In accordance with this, three kinds of judgments are distinguished: problematic - judgments in which a statement or negation is taken only as possible; assertive - judgments in which a statement or negation is taken as valid; apodictic - judgments in which a statement or negation is taken as necessary. Thus, modality shows how judgment is related to one's cognitive capacity.

In this connection, the theory of so-called "possible worlds" is also interesting. The medieval philosopher John Duns Scotus first spoke of "possible worlds." The thinker argued that the real world is only one of the existing possibilities, the others may not be realized at all, but at the same time constitute a real alternative to the real world. At a later time the idea of "possible worlds" is developed in the works of the German philosopher, physicist and mathematician H.W. Leibniz.

In linguistics the category of modality has many aspects of study and is considered from various scientific positions. A comprehensive characteristic of modality can be found in the works of Academician V.V. Vinogradov [7]. He traced the history of the study of this category, outlined the range of means of expressing modality, identified its volume and specific content. He believes that every sentence contains an indication of the attitude towards reality. Another Russian linguist I.R. Galperin is of the same opinion, considering modality as a category inherent in the language in reality, i.e. speech, and therefore being the very essence of the communicative process [8].

However, modern authors put forward a narrower understanding of modality, which define modality as the relation of the content of a sentence to reality from the point of view of the speaker [13]. Others understand modality as the opposition of the real/irreal relation of a sentence to reality [10]. The viewpoint according to which the invariant meaning of modality is the relation of the content of the statement to reality, i.e. modality extends to the attitude of the subject of the statement to the action and the attitude of the speaker to the reliability of the content of the statement is also widely spread. In this approach, many varieties and means of expressing

modality are declared secondary or left out of this multifaceted but integral category altogether. This point of view is presented in the works of A. V. Bondarko [6], M. Grepla [9], V. Z. Panfilov [13] and some other linguists.

According to E.N. Alieva, the nature of the manifestation of the category of modality can also be seen in the fact that this category is a constantly acting, constitutive feature of the sentence; functions at the logical and grammatical level of sentence generation; is divided into objective, subjective modality, expressing various modal meanings from simple narrative to emotional and expressive; and, finally, modality equally serves both grammatical sentence and logical judgement in the process of their generation [1].

Objective modality is an obligatory feature of any statement. It, according to V.Z. Panfilov [13], reflects the nature of objective connections, available in this or that situation, on which the cognitive act is directed, namely connections possible, valid and necessary. Subjective modality expresses the speaker's evaluation of the degree of cognition of these relations, i.e. it indicates the degree of reliability of the thought reflecting a given situation and includes problematic, simple, and categorical reliability.

In addition, different types of emotional expression are intertwined and partially intertwined with the category of modality (indignation, admiration, threat, etc.). According to V.V. Vinogradov [7], it is necessary to make a fundamentally clear distinction between different emotional forms of expression of reactions to reality and the modal evaluation of the attitude of the statement to reality, although both of these spheres of speech phenomena have the closest interaction. He believed that modal meanings extend towards the expression of different logical-evaluation and emotional-evaluation meanings and stylistic qualification of speech, which are transmitted in a sentence by means of different introductory-modal formations.

According to N. Y. Shvedova [16] the emotional attitude towards the reported is qualified as modal. But along with this, a view is developing in which emotional-expressive relations are excluded from the category of modality.

G.A. Zolotova [10], treating the notion of modality mainly as an expression of attitude in terms of credibility/unreliability, distinguishes three types of relations: first, this is the relation of the content of the utterance (as a predicate attribute) to reality from the speaker's point of view; second, the relation to the utterance content; third, the relation between the subject - the attribute bearer and the predicate attribute.

Modality in the interpretation of C. Bally [3] acts as a syntactic category, in the expression of which the primary role is played by modal verbs, denoting the

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

judgment of the speaker about the subject of speech. As a proponent of a broad understanding of modality, he considered modality to be the soul of the sentence, and included among the modal meanings a variety of shades of judgment, feeling or will, which are expressed by modal verbs, inclinations, intonation, question forms, commands, modal gestures, facial expressions, interjections and other techniques through which the interlocutor's attention is awakened and maintained.

Later, based on the concept of C. Bally [3], a number of domestic and foreign scientists began to allocate communicative form of statement as the main component of modal meaning. If T. B. Alisova [2] distinguishes communicative and subjective evaluative modality, E. Benvenist [5] considers that communication-related functions of speech are captured in the forms of sentence modality, i.e. affirmative, interrogative and imperative types of sentences reflect the basic positions of the speaker who influences the interlocutor by his speech: the speaker either wants to convey elements of knowledge to the interlocutor, or receive from him information, or - order to do something.

In English linguistics studies of this category are as numerous and diverse as in the Russian linguistic tradition. The composition of modal categories in the concepts of different authors varies from two to seven classes. In Paul Portner's book "Modality" (Modality, 2009) it is noted that two approaches are most common: a) opposition of epistemic and non-epistemic (root) modality (the latter includes all other categories of modality); b) opposition of three categories: epistemic, deontic and dynamic modality, expressing possibility [24, p. 136]. P. Portner himself believes that the category of modality is represented by the following classes: epistemic, deontic modality, desire modality, teleological, volitional and quantificational modality (the last two classes express possibility) [24, p. 137]. Werner Abraham and Elisabeth Leiss distinguish complex patterns of modality, which have not yet been described due to their complexity, and covert modality, which includes unquestionably modal categories (modal verbs, introductory words and turns) [17, p. 1-2]. Linguist Kai von Fintel singles out the following modal categories: alethic, epistemic, deontic modality, modality of desire (optative modality), dynamic, teleological modality [19, p. 21]. Valentine Hacquard offers a classification, which terminologically differs from the above, but does not go beyond their frames: epistemic, true deontic modality, two modal classes of

non-epistemic modality, namely capability modality and goal oriented or teleological modality [20].

There is no unambiguous opinion among linguists as to the number of forms of the verbal inclination. According to the approach of various scholars, the English inclination system includes up to 16 inclinations [18], while some researchers completely deny the existence of this category [21]. In between these extremes there are intermediate views, e.g., many grammarians hold to the system of three moods, the indicative, the imperative and the subjunctive, commonly used in traditional grammar. Professor A. Smirnitkii proposed a system of six inclinations [14]. L. S. Barkhudarov's "Essays on Modern English Morphology" says that the grammatical category of declension "is formed by contrasting two categorial forms, the indicative and the imperative declension" [4, p. 134-135]. The theory of speech acts developed by J. Austin and J. Searle in the second half of the 20th century became the impetus for the emergence of various options for classifying speech acts. Thus, J. Surl distinguished five types of speech acts based on their illocutionary function: representatives (messages), directives (inducements), commissives (promises), expressives (expression of emotional state), declaratives (appointments). Linguist J. Leach named four types of illocutionary acts, while D. Wunderlich named eight, and V. V. Bogdanov named nine types of speech acts differing in their illocution [15].

Conclusion

Thus, analyzing the scientific literature, we can say that the concept of modality has a multifaceted treatment in linguistics, which requires in-depth study. Since the category of modality is recognized as very complex, the attitude to it is ambiguous, there is no consensus about its nature. Thus, some scientists consider it as a gnoseological concept, not related to the personal evaluation of the object of thought, while others believe that this category manifests a subject-evaluation attitude. At the same time, everyone recognizes that the category of modality includes the expression of reality/unreality of an utterance. In linguistics, modality is regarded as a complex functional-semantic category, which is related to reality and to the opinion of the speaker. Consequently, this category is of great interest in linguistics, as each language is individual and has its own specific grammatical and lexical units expressing modality.

References:

Impact Factor:

ISRA (India) = 6.317
ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582
GIF (Australia) = 0.564
JIF = 1.500

SIS (USA) = 0.912
PIHII (Russia) = 3.939
ESJI (KZ) = 8.771
SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184

ICV (Poland) = 6.630
PIF (India) = 1.940
IBI (India) = 4.260
OAJI (USA) = 0.350

1. Alieva, E. N. (2010). *Funkcional'no-semanticheskaya kategoriya modal'nosti i ee realizatsiya v raznostrukturnykh yazykakh* (russkom, angliiskom, lezginskom): Avtoref. dis. dok. filol. nauk. (p.50). Moscow. [in Russian].
2. Alisova, T.B. (1969). *Semantiko-kommunikativnyi substrat bez lichnykh predlojenii. Invariantnye sintaksicheskie znacheniya i struktura predlojeniya* (Doklady na konferencii po teoreticheskim problemam sintaksisa). (pp.27-36). Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian].
3. Balli, Sh. (1955). *Obschaya lingvistika i voprosy francuzskogo yazyka*. (p.416). Moscow: Izd-vo inostr.liter. [in Russian].
4. Barhudarov, L.S. (2009). *Ocherki po morfologii sovremennogo angliiskogo yazyka*. 2-e izdanie, dopolnennoe. (p.155). Moskva: URSS. Sovmestnoe izdanie s «Librokom». [in Russian].
5. Benvenist, E. (1974). *Obschaya lingvistika*. (p.447). Moscow: Progress. [in Russian].
6. Bondarko, A.V. (1990). *Real'nost' / irreal'nost' i potencial'nost'*. TFG, (pp.72-80). Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian].
7. Vinogradov, V.V. (1975). *O kategorii modal'nosti i modal'nykh slovah v russkom yazyke*. Izbrannye trudy. Issledovaniya po russkoi grammatike. (pp.53-87). Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian].
8. Gal'perin, I.R. (1981). *Tekst kak ob'ekt lingvisticheskogo issledovaniya*. (p.139). Moscow. [in Russian].
9. Grepl', M. (1973). *O suschnosti modal'nosti. Yazykoznaneya v Chehoslovakii*. Moscow. [in Russian].
10. Zolotova, G.A. (1962). O modal'nosti predlojeniya v russkom yazyke. *FN*, 1962, №1, pp.65-80. [in Russian].
11. Isaev, A.V. (1961). *K voprosu o delenii suzdenii po modal'nosti*. Logiko-grammaticheskie ocherki. (pp.85-96). Moscow. [in Russian].
12. Kant, I. (1964). *Sochineniya: v 6 t., T. 3*, (p.799). Moscow: Mysl'. [in Russian].
13. Panfilov, V.Z. (1977). *Kategorii modal'nosti i ee rol' konstruktirovaniy struktury predlojeniya i suzdeniya*. VYA. [in Russian].
14. Smirnitskii, A.I. (1959). *Morfologiya angliiskogo yazyka*. Passek VV, redaktor. (p.440). Moskva: Izdatel'stvo literatury na inostrannykh yazykakh. [in Russian].
15. Susov, I.P. (2006). *Lingvisticheskaya pragmatika*. (p.200). Moskva: Vostok - Zapad. [in Russian].
16. Shvedova, N.Yu. (1960). *Ocherki po sintaksisu russkoi razgovornoj rechi*. (p.377). Moscow: Nauka. [in Russian].
17. Abraham, W., & Leiss, E. (2012). *Introduction*. In: Abraham W, Leiss E. *Covert Patterns of Modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars Publishing. (pp.1-24).
18. Deutschbein, M. (1928). *System der neuenglischen Syntax*. (p.328). Leipzig: Quelle & Meyer.
19. Fintel von, K. (2006). *Modality and Language*. In: Borcher MD, editor. *Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 2nd edition. (pp.20-27). New York: Thomson Gale.
20. Hacquard, V. (2000). *Aspects of Modality*. (p.214). Los Angeles: University of California.
21. Palmer, F.R. (1978). *Grammar*. (p.200). Middlesex: Penguin Books.
22. Portner, P. (2009). *Modality*. (p.288). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Impact Factor:	ISRA (India) = 6.317	SIS (USA) = 0.912	ICV (Poland) = 6.630
	ISI (Dubai, UAE) = 1.582	ПИИИ (Russia) = 3.939	PIF (India) = 1.940
	GIF (Australia) = 0.564	ESJI (KZ) = 8.771	IBI (India) = 4.260
	JIF = 1.500	SJIF (Morocco) = 7.184	OAJI (USA) = 0.350
