

OBJECTIVE AND SUBJECTIVE MODALITY CATEGORIES IN THE ENGLISH AND KARAKALPAK LANGUAGES

Bayimbetova Mekhriban Berdibaevna

Assistant teacher of the English language and literature department,
Nukus State Pedagogical Institute, Nukus, Karakalpakistan

Boribayev Koldasbay Bazarbayevich

Trainee-teacher of the English language and literature department,
Nukus State Pedagogical Institute, Nukus, Karakalpakistan

Abstract: This study deals with the distinction between subjective and objective modality on the basis of the English and Karakalpak languages. It shows the distinction with examples, both in terms of the criteria that has been proposed to support it, and in terms of the actual delineation of subjectivity and objectivity in the modal domain. Since the material is concerned with comparative the results play significant capacity in the subject of Comparative typology. The relevance of this study lies in the fact that attention is paid not only to the comparison of modal verbs in English and Karakalpak languages, but also their use in specific types of speech act. The study examines the patterns that manifest themselves in a comparative study of the specific phenomena of two or more languages.

Key words: category, reality, doubt, irreality, utterance, attitude, modal words, expression, opinion, presumption.

Introduction. Language modality is the most important and relevant phenomenon of modern linguistics. This phenomenon is characterized by its specificity and diversity of opinions of famous scientists. In modern English, modality is expressed with various grammatical, lexical, and intonational means.

Modality category types

There is a theory of modality which was provided by Ch. Bally and in accordance with it modality expresses 2 types of relations and includes 2 levels [1.159]. That's why the linguists usually differentiate between 2 types of modality: objective (or primary) and subjective (or secondary). Ch. Bally considered that each utterance consists of two parts, the part which presents information (he called it 'dictum') and the part which presents the speaker's evaluation of this information (he called it 'modus').

The primary modality expresses the relation of the contents of the sentence to reality as established by the speaker who, choosing the appropriate form of the mood presents the event as real, unreal or desirable. It is expressed by

the grammatical form of mood and thus it is a component of predicativity and as such it always finds a grammatical expression in the sentence. *E.g. You are my wife. Be my wife. I wish you were my wife.* Thus, primary modality as a component of predicativity is an obligatory feature of the sentence - we cannot make a sentence without expressing primary modality [1.159].

Secondary modality presents another layer of modality, built over the primary modality. It does not always find an explicit expression in the sentence. Secondary modality is not homogeneous. It contains two layers and we can differentiate between two types of secondary modality. The first type expresses the relations between the subject of the sentence and the action. The action may be presented as possible, permissive, obligatory, necessary, desirable or unnecessary for the subject. It is expressed by the modal verbs in their verb-oriented meanings: ability, possibility, permission, necessity, obligation etc. *E.g. Children must be seen but not heard. I can jump puddles. You may be free for today.* The second type of secondary modality expresses the attitude of the speaker to the contents of the utterance or the speaker's evaluation of the event presented in the utterance. This type of modality can be expressed by: 1) modal words and modal adverbs and modal particles: maybe, probably, certainly, of course, perhaps, sure, evidently, supposedly, luckily, fortunately etc. (E.g. This is probably the best chance you have ever had); 2) by modal verbs in their sentence-oriented meanings: probability, doubt, supposition, certainty, disbelief (E.g. She couldn't have done it alone); 3) by modalized verbs seem, to appear, happen, chance (She appeared to be holding something back from him); 4) by the so called performative verbs and phrases which name speech and mental acts: think, suppose, guess, doubt, be certain, be sure etc. (e.g. I guess you are right; I am afraid this is true); 5) by special syntactic structures like 'tag questions' (This is true, isn't it?), as well as 6) by intonation and word order. As we can see the modal verbs participate in the expression of two kinds of secondary modality [1.159].

Subjective and objective categories

Russian scientist Belyaeva defines modality as a subjective objective category of language. This definition reflects the objectively subjective nature of the category of modality: subjectivity of the actual assessment of reality is limited by objective relationships (which does not mean that everyone who speaks adequately evaluates them) [2.1985].

G.A. Zolotova distinguishes between objective and subjective modality as "In the works of recent years devoted to questions of modality, the terms objective modality and subjective modality are found" [3. 65-79]. Offering to use these very concepts, G.A. Zolotova defines the relationship in the first formulation as objective modality, and in the second is subjective. At the same time, the third modal aspect (the relation between the subject and the action) does not matter for the modal characteristic of the sentence. In our opinion, her conclusions are fair, that:

a) The main modal meaning or objective modality is a necessary constructive sign of each sentence, subjective modality is an optional, optional sign;

b) Subjective modality, without changing the main modal meaning of the sentence, presents this value in special coverage [3. 65-79].

Subjective and objective modality category in the Karakalpak language

In the Karakalpak language, category of modality is mainly the category representing different attitudes of the subject to the object, reality and truth like the beliefs, doubts, wishes, assumptions, desires, etc. In other words, the expression of the narrator's subjective view on the content of the sentence or the content of the narrative of the sentence, in which the truth is contained. Because the speaker always expresses his attitude to the situation and the content of the sentence, its structure. This attitude is the modality or the author's attitude to reality thus, the meaning of modality is a category expresses speaker's opinion or viewpoint about surrounding cases. Basically,

there are two types of modality: objective and subjective [5. 9].

The reality of the opinion is not related to the speaker's own opinion is an objective modality; Objective modality can be expressed by mood or tense and express a real action(keledi, kelgen edi) or unreal action which express order, obligation and wish(kel,kelse edi, kelerme edi).

In subjective modality, the speaker expresses his or her subjective attitude toward the case. Expressing a subjective evaluative attitude to the idea does not reveal the essence of the phenomenon in many types of texts, certain excerpts of the text provide information about the author's worldview. Therefore, the text modality is often expressed in the relative excerpts within the different levels of information contained in the relative and predicative excerpts [4. 411].

When the modal word used as subjective modality, it stands individually not following any other parts of speech, that is why they are called introductory modal words. For example: It is truth, this requires more spiritual understanding. (*Haqiqatinda da, bul ruwxiy ko'бирек tusinikti talap etedi.*)

It is right, we should rely on household wisdom.

(*Duris, xojaliq danaligina s'byeniw kerek.*) (T.Qayıpbergenov)

Thus, modal words express the speaker's subjective attitude to the relationship of the nature and the surrounding events, coming from the point of view of the relations of suspicion, probability, possibility, necessity, relevance, with following other parts of speeches.

Conclusion. To sum up, the modality category is differentiated into two types: objective and subjective. Objective modality is an indispensable feature of any utterance, one of the categories forming a predicative unit is a sentence. This type of modality expresses the relation of the communicated to reality in terms of reality (feasibility or feasibility). Objective modality is organically connected with the category of time and is differentiated by the sign of temporal

certainty – uncertainty. The meaning of time and reality – irreality merged into one; the complex of these values is called objective-modal values.

Subjective modality is the speaker's relation to the message. Unlike objective modality, it is an optional feature of a statement. The semantic volume of subjective modality is much wider than the semantic volume of objective modality.

The semantic basis of subjective modality is formed by the concept of evaluation in the broad sense of the word, including not only the logical (intellectual, rational) qualifications of the communicant, but also different types of emotional (irrational) reactions.

References

1. Bally Ch. General Linguistics and questions of English Language. Science Journal, 2003 – 159 p.
2. Belyaeva, E. I. Functional semantic fields of modality in English and Russian. Voronezh: Publishing house of Voronezh University, 1985.
3. Zolotova, G. A. On the modality of sentences in Russian. Philological Sciences, 1962,4, 65-79.
4. The grammar of modern Karakalpak literal language. Nukus "Bilim", 1994. 411-page. [Published in Karakalpak as Хәзирги қарақалпақ әдебий тилиниң грамматикасы. Сөз жасалыў хәм морфология. Нөкис «Билим», 1994. 411-б.]
5. Karimbaev S. "Qaraqalpaq tilinde modal sózler". Qaraqalpaq Mámleketlik Universiteti. Nókis. 2019. 9-10b.
6. Berdimuratov K., Esemuratov A. The Karakalpak language. Nukus. Vol.I. 1962 [Published in Karakalpak, Berdimuratov K., Esemuratov A. Qaraqalpaq tili sabaqlığı. I bòlim. Nòkis, 1962].
7. Buranov J. B. Comparative typology of English and Turkic languages. Moscow. 1983. [Published in Russian; Буранов Ж. Б. Сравнительная типология английского И тюркских языков. Москва. 1983].