

**ЎЗБЕКИСТОН РЕСПУБЛИКАСИ
ОЛИЙ ВА ЎРТА МАХСУС ТАЪЛИМ ВАЗИРЛИГИ
ЖИЗЗАХ ДАВЛАТ ПЕДАГОГИКА ИНСТИТУТИ**



**ИНГЛИЗ ТИЛИНИ ЎРГАНИШДА
ИННОВАЦИЯЛАР ВА ЎҚИТИШ АМАЛИЁТИ
Халқаро илмий-амалий конференция
2019 йил 15 март**

**International scientific-practical conference
INNOVATIONS AND TEACHING PRACTICES IN
ENGLISH LANGUAGE LEARNING
March 15, 2019**

**Международная научно-практическая конференция
ИННОВАЦИИ И ПРАКТИКА ОБУЧЕНИЯ В
ИЗУЧЕНИИ АНГЛИЙСКОГО ЯЗЫКА
15 марта, 2019 г**

ЖИЗЗАХ - 2019

Contrastive analysis can be carried out at three linguistic levels: phonology, grammar (morphology and syntax) and lexis (vocabulary). The word is a structural & semantic entity within the language system. The word as well as any linguistic sign is a two-faced unit possessing both form & content or, to be more exact, sound-form & meaning.

When used in actual speech the word undergoes certain modification & functions in one of its forms. The system showing a word in all its word-forms is called a paradigm. The lexical meaning of a word is the same throughout the paradigm. The grammatical meaning varies from one form to another. Therefore when we speak on any word as used in actual speech we use the term "word" conventionally because what is manifested in the utterances is not a word as a whole but one of its forms which is identified as belonging to the definite paradigm. Words as a whole are to be found in the dictionary (showing the paradigm n - noun and v - verb).

THE SYSTEM OF MODALITY

Maxmudova Zuhra, KarSU

Before presenting the descriptive article within which the concept of modality will be discussed in this work, a brief consideration of previous attempts to impose a system on the semantics of the modals will be provided, in acknowledgement of the difficulties inherent in any such attempt. In order to account for, and to order, the diversity of meanings expressed by the modal auxiliaries, a descriptive framework must be at once systematic, if it is to have any explanatory power, and flexible, if it is to accommodate the variety of contextually conditioned meanings with which the modal auxiliaries are compatible. While a few linguists present their analysis simply in the form of a list of 'uses' distinguished for each modal (Huddleston, for example, observes that his study is "more semantic, less formal than [Palmer's] 10" and lists the meanings of each auxiliary), and yet others are content with having arrived at "a rather loosely structured set of relationships"; but the majority of writers are preoccupied with the attempt to reveal the semantic system underlying the meanings expressed by the modal auxiliaries. Marino, for example, entertains no doubt of the existence of such a system. Despite recognising the difficulty of the task 12 involved in exposing it, he maintains that "there seems to be no easy response to the multiple meanings and nuances of the modal system, but we certainly need an appropriate device for the description of the system qua system" (1973:311, my underlining). And even Palmer, who believes that "the subject is not one that lends itself to any simple explanation" (1979:40) and, like Ehrman (1966), is critical of any highly structured analysis of the modals, is anxious to refute Anderson's criticism (1971:113) that his approach to modality is 'unsystematic', and devotes a separate section (Palmer, 1979:39-40) to an account of the 'organisation' of his 'exposition'. A number of different models of the nature of meaning have been adapted in the attempt to reconcile a sense of a modal system with the meanings expressed by the modal auxiliaries. Those linguists, such as Joos (1964), Ehrman (1966), and Tregidgo (1982) who, by adopting a basic or core meaning approach, assume that each modal auxiliary is essentially monosemous, tend to allow for semantic variability by accepting that meaning is noncategorical or non-discrete, so that for example the ability and possibility uses of CAN merge into one another. Unitary approaches to meaning, however, are widely criticised - Anderson (1971:113) comments upon "the opacity of the labels which Joos Chooses to characterise his classes of modals. With respect to these, I must agree with Palmer in finding them 'vague and general' ". Perkins (1980:50) finds further fault, saying that "the elegance of Joos' account is marred by the fact that it does not accord with the intuitions of many native speakers", ie the distinction Joos draws between, for example, the 'contingency' of WILL and the 'adequacy' of SHALL is counterintuitive.

MUST and MAY, on the other hand, are polysemous, with a clear-cut distinction between their epistemic and root meanings. Further semantic indeterminacy results from the fact that tokens of the modals may yield more than one interpretation, and that the two (or more) meanings may be in an 'either-or' relationship (eg ambiguous - rare in actual texts, by virtue of the contextual clues provided) or alternatively, in a 'both-and' relationship (Leech and Coates (1980) use the term

'merger'), where both meanings are mutually compatible, the differences between them having been subject to contextual neutralisation. Halliday is drawing the same distinction when he observes that. The complex nature of the relationship between modality [= epistemic modality] and modulation (= root modality) is brought out by consideration of the ambiguities that arise - which appear sometimes as ambiguities and sometimes as blends ... [With] clearly ambiguous ... instances ... the hearer has to select one or the other [of] ... the two interpretations ... [With] blends ... there appears to be no requirement of selecting just one or the other interpretation ... The distinction between modality and modulation tends to be neutralised in a hypothetical environment. (in Kress, 1976:205-207).

Note that Halliday disposes of the problem of the semantic heterogeneity of the modals by essentially terminological means - his view of the relationship between the concept of modality and the meanings of the modals is idiosyncratic, in that he offers a very narrow definition of modality as "the speaker's assessment of the probabilities inherent in the situation" (Halliday and Hasan, 1976:135) and discusses all other meanings expressed by the modals under the heading of 'modulation'. He does, however, as in the extract quoted above, acknowledge the closeness of the two concepts, even going so far as to say that modality may be used in a 'derived sense' to refer to 'rights and duties' (Halliday and Hasan, *ibid*) ie to root modality. As an example of a blend, Halliday offers (22) He COULD have escaped if he'd tried. Having distinguished modal meanings or modalities (including - determination, intention, ability, certainty, possibility, necessity, want, hope, 36 permission etc), he then considers how they may be combined and warns that "although the plus sign is used to indicate that more than one modality is expressed by a modal, it is not necessarily to be understood to mean 'and', ie that the modalities are simultaneously expressed by the modal. It may well be argued that there is an alternative of choosing one or the other interpretation". Hermeren discouragingly concludes that 'it is well-nigh impossible' to distinguish between a 'both-and' and an 'either-or' relationship (1978:150).

Equally discouraging is Marino's warning to the effect that "the lack of agreement by native speakers about a particular modal phrase ... must well remain alarming for any investigator because it abnegates any final taxonomy" (1973:312)22. I would accept that minor dialectal and/or idiolectal variability in the use of the modal auxiliaries does exist - consider Palmer and Strang's contradictory observations about *mayn't* in contemporary British English (referred to on p 24 above), and Halliday's comment that "in my own speech possible tends to go with *may* and perhaps with *might*, but the two are interchangeable and other speakers probably have different patterns" (in Kress, 1976:193-194).

The well-known diachronic instability of the modals (see for example Strang, 1970:148 ff) is also relevant here, since a change in usage takes place over a period of time, proceeding at different rates in different parts of the country and for each speaker. An example of a current change is the development whereby *MAY*, in cases of personal permission, is giving way in modern English to the more informal *CAN* (Twaddell, 1963:14, Tregidgo, 1982:85).

The collocation must well used by Marino in the extract quoted above itself provides evidence for the existence of variation between speakers, since in my own idiolect only *MAY* or *MIGHT* collocate with *WELL* functioning as an intensifier: You MIGHT well blush.

He MAY well be late.

As a viewer watching the Labour Party Conference one MIGHT well take the view that you on the Left ... are united on policies and are winning the day PA Though. He CAN'T very well say no now, can he? would also be acceptable. In fact, the present study goes further than this, in that it considers the core meaning of nonfactivity to apply to each and every member of the set of modals, rather than providing a separate quantitative stereotype for each member. The semantic heterogeneity and indeterminacy of the modal auxiliaries should not therefore be exaggerated, nor viewed as prohibitive to systematic analysis. As Palmer observes (1979:172-173), indeterminacy must be acknowledged, but does not invalidate any attempt to categorise. Gregory (1980) commends Halliday for the balance he achieves between "respecting the untidiness of what happens when people speak and write" and the desire to "tame this wilderness in a ...