Kidirniyazova Perigul Seytniyazovna

Nukus Mining Institute

MOTIONS VERBS AND THEIR MODALITY FEATURES IN MODERN ENGLISH

Abstract: *this article about motions verbs and their modality features in modern English.*

Key words*: modality, semantic, obligation, dynamic modality, intentional conception, terminology, polysemous, non-polysemous, boulomaic modality, manifestation*

This section deals with the modality features and functions of verbs expressing ***to start, to leave, to sail, to return, to arrive, to go, to come*** and etc. in

Modern English. In the English linguistics study of modality of verbs, including modal words on which a number of scientific works have been written, have always been in the focus of attention of the scholars. In the dictionary of linguistic terminology modality has been given as the attitude of the speaker towards the expressed thought, as grammatical semantic category expressing the attitude of the objective reality towards the thought which is expressed [8, 101]. Some linguists have studied modality functions of a number of verbs, existing in the English language. In spite of the fact that a number of scientific works have been devoted to the study of ***to start, to leave, to sail, to return, to arrive, to go, to come*** as the modality of verbs in linguistics, this problem is still causing the subject of dispute among the linguists. Though ***to start, to leave, to sail, to return, to arrive, to go, to come*** are not accepted as modality by the logical semantics, a number of scholars have assumed ***to start, to leave, to sail, to return, to arrive, to go, to come*** as the meaning of modality and have made attempts to prove this problem [30, 99].

Some of these authors determine modality parameters as a theoretical basis for their classification and each of which plays a certain role in determining

---

modality. It includes, for example, the attitude of the speaker to the situation (assessment), the status of the situation directed to real attitude (irreality) etc. The second model appeared on the boundaries of diachronic morphology theory being one of the functional theories. In this case wish is affirmed. It often exists in association with diachronic modality [9, 165]. Though they belong *to start, to leave, to sail, to return, to arrive, to go, to come* to modality.

Prof. A. Smirnitskiy notes that meaning of *to start, to leave, to sail, to return, to arrive, to go, to come* is a type of modality, and it expresses objective situation of a person [19, 145]. But other investigations suppose that one structure of the verbs denoting *to start, to leave, to sail, to return, to arrive, to go, to come* express modality but the others' don't [26, 100].

Some scholars evaluate modality of the verbs expressing modality as something emerging from the meaning of "obligation". Ch. Fillmore notes that modality in the English grammar expresses possibility and obligation [21, 223].

It is considered that the verbs denoting the meaning of *to start and to leave*, during their syntactic-semantic analysis in the sentence, important categories associated with the conception of wish driven from the contents must be taken into consideration. As to Huddleston R., it is necessary to take into consideration different colorings characteristics for each type of *to start and to leave*, to determine the character of the attitudes between the modality of *to start and to leave* with the category of affirmation or (negation), to study the circle of impact of the meaning of *to start and to leave* within the text, to make clear in which attitudes can the sentences with the verbs denoting *to start and to leave* can be in relations with other sentences within the contents [24, 155].

M. Keto's thoughts on the modality of verbs expressing *to start and to leave* are also of interest. The investigator in his research work called "Semantic field of verbs denoting to start and to leave" in the modern English language" while analyzing the agreement of verbs expressing modality, speaks of valency of verbs on certain language, more exactly speaking, lexis conception [68, 24].

M. Keto determines two semi-groups in the composition of group of verbs denoting ***to start and to leave*** on the basis of the analyzed words:

1) verbs denoting ***to start and to leave*** which have tendency to modality;

2) verbs denoting ***to start and to leave*** which have no tendency to modality.

Verbs agreeing only with nouns within the construction are included into the list of the verbs of ***to start and to leave*** having tendency to modality. These are "to sail", "to return", "to arrive", "to go", "to come" and other verbs.

But the verbs agreeing only with nouns but also with infinitive within the construction are expressed with the verbs of ***to start and to leave*** which have more tendencies to modality. It includes verbs such as "to desire", "to want", "to wish", "to long for", "to hunger for/after", "to die for", "to pine for", "to yearn for", "to emulate" [69, 45].

Levin B. has investigated intentional conceptions and means of their expressions in English directed to modality. Expression of speaker's '***to come'*** in the process of communication is one of the important forms of manifestations of modality. Levin B. discriminates directive expression of '***to come'*** from the form of '***come'*** expressions denoting non-directive expressions of subjective thirst for and he includes into the circle of influence of '***to come'*** expressing of both, addressed (aim-denoting) [33, 100].

Levin B. has introduced '***to come'*** expressing modality in objective optative modality in the widest form.

1) The author includes into the first group the verbs denoting passionate, strong ***to come.***

2) The verb '***to come'*** is included into the second group. The willfulness expressed by these verbs is weaker in comparison with the verbs mentioned in the first group.

3) Into this group are included such verbs and verbal constructions expressing '***to come'***. The following verb is included into this group: ***"to be going" + infinitive, "have to go", "to be in a mood*** [33, 86].

Some other linguists consider the verbs denoting motion verbs as boulomaic modality as a type of dynamic modality, as it has a "person". Perkins M. notes that indication of a person drives from the motion verbs of a person and it is like deontic volitive modality [35, 111].

Jackendoff R. in his investigations has touched upon the problem of modality of the verb '***to return***'. The author notes that '***to return***' not depending on whether it is real or unreal always bears potential contents. The characterization of obligatory modality between the object and its features is taking place in a certain time (past, present, or future tenses). Verbal predicate of present tense expresses modal attitude towards the reality. But those which express past tense states suspicious attitude to the reality or to its realization [29, 171].

Petrov N. in her investigations notes that the concept of modality exists in narrow and wider senses. The wider understanding of modality is based upon any evaluative attitude of the person towards the reality and at this time thought, emotion, understanding notions may be completely valued as lawful representation

of modality [16, 125].

Verbs '**to come**' and '**to go**' as to their features often do not differ from the verbs expressing emotion, thought, and understanding which makes it possible to belong them to a proper group. Verbs '**to come**' and '**to go**' in most languages of the world never join the modal verbs [16, 126]. Hereon we may come to the conclusion that Petrov N. too affirms the modality of verbs expressing '**to come**' and '**to go**'.

The verbs '**to come**' and '**to go**' are belonged to the group of motion verbs, their differences are also indicated. In the modality as to the existence of fact, the realization of '**to come**' and '**to go**' are expressed as possible. The modality '**to come**' and '**to go**' realize the fact and find their reflections [15, 99].

Pocheptsov G.G. in his research work has investigated the modality of verbs '**to come**' and '**to go**' and has valued them as the form of manifestation of

subjective modality to be studied from the functional-syntactic and pragmatic aspects. The author notes that the subjective modality determines the contents of

the subjective attitude [17, 144].

Besides that, Rudnev A.G. stresses the fact of belonging of the expression of contents of the subjective modality to the different language levels. (lexic, morphological, and syntactic levels). To the lexic level belongs such language units, in which content of '**to come'** and '**to go'** are expressed by nuclear of these units [18, 148].

Rudnev A.G. pays special attention to the subjective contents of '**to come'** and '**to go'** and stresses the fact of much dependence of this factor on the communicative focus of the expression.. In this case taking the degree of highness of the expression of '**to come'** and '**to go'** are taken into consideration in the choice of this or that verb which is the main factor. For example: *1) He is to come at 6:00 a.m.; 2) They are to go at 7:00 p.m.*

This section aims to investigate the modality features of verbs expressing '**to come'** and '**to go'** in Modern English. The study attempts to address the following two questions:

1) Do '**to come'** and '**to go'** have modality features in English?

2) How do they express modality in different contexts?

The researches of different linguists were analyzed theoretically. Referring to the preferred concepts, the verbs '**to come'** and '**to go'** were studied in details pragmatically and grammatically. By using different literature, the verbs '**to come'** and '**to go'** were analyzed and modality features of the verbs were investigated in

different contexts [23, 111].

Taking all above-mentioned into consideration, we come to the conclusion that the verbs '**to come'** and '**to go'** can express the modality. They have modality,

but not strongly expressed and their modality can only be observed in context.

2.4. THE GRAMMATICAL CATEGORY OF MODALITY

Assuming that the differences in interaction with tense and aspect between flavors of modality can be reduced to scope [22, 147], one can ask why modal flavor should correlate with modal scope: why should a modal like *'to arrive'* scope 'high' (above tense and aspect) when it receives a modal interpretation, but

'low' (below tense and aspect) with a root interpretation?

English is analytical language. If all modals, of English, show the same constraints, then we might be able to explain the interactions with tense and aspect purely in terms of meaning. If, however, English does not show the same constraints, then we need to explain why polysemy should correlate with flavor/scope interactions. R. Huddleston [25, 112] proposes that the ordering of functional heads is fixed universally (as shown in (2) Does this ordering truly hold universally, and if so, does it follow from meaning considerations only? (2) Cinque's Hierarchy (simplified): Mod > Tense > Aspect > Mod > ... epis root. It seems clear that the flavor/scope correlation cannot be based on meaning alone, since lexical verbs and adjectives that express the same flavors of modality do not show the same constraints. Adjectives (possible, likely) and motion verbs (arrive, return, sail) that express modal meanings can be interpreted under a past tense (3). Nouns like permission and verbs like want that express root meanings do not yield actuality entailments with perfective (4):

1. It seemed to John/It was possible/likely that Mary returns.

2. John thought/knew that Mary arrives.

3. Jean has had the permission to return, but he didn't return.

While modal auxiliaries are relatively common, verbs, nouns, and adjectives are over-whelming fully specified for meaning. Why should full meaning specification correlate with the functional/lexical divide, and what is this

functional/lexical divide in the first place? Looking at predicates that straddle the functional/lexical line, such as restructuring verbs, and processes of grammaticalization where lexical morphemes turn into functional ones may provide useful clues. Restructuring verbs behave like functional heads in forming a single clause with their complements, with a single tense and aspect projection [31, 65].

We see that what differentiates 'grammatical' modals from 'lexical' modals are both their polysemy and their interactions with tense and aspect. What about modal markers that are not polysemous? There are two logical possibilities. They could either lack anaphoricity altogether: their lexical entry could then hard-wire both meaning and scope. Alternatively, they could be just like their polysemous

counterparts: event-relative, but with lexical restrictions on the kinds of modal bases they allow. For instance, an event-relative modal could be specified to only allow content-based modal bases. Such modals would have to appear in a position where they would be anchored to a contentful event (e.g., speech event). We would expect modals' scope to correlate with meaning with the second option, but

not necessarily with the first. How do polysemous languages actually behave?

Modals are fully specified for meaning, and they do not seem to show scope/meaning correlations. English counterparts and easily scopes under tense:

It was possible/necessary that John returned.

Whether this ordering of modals can be explained solely on conceptual grounds (and whether it really holds cross-linguistically) are not entirely settled [32, 248]. Grammatical modal markers, whether polysemous or not, would all be event-relative, and project modal bases from the event they are relative to, explaining the correlation between scope and meaning. Non-polysemous languages would differ from polysemous ones in lexically imposing restrictions on the kinds of modal bases their modals can combine with.

Clearly, much more empirical work is needed before a definite answer can be provided, as much more is known about the interaction between modals, tense and aspect in English. What gets classified as modal markers in grammars do not necessarily form a uniform grammatical class?

Languages may differ in whether modality is expressed by functional morphemes or solely by lexical ones. They further differ in whether their modals

show polysemy or not.

Hopefully the clues for such a distinction (morphological and other) will be clear enough.

Modality, the items available for meaning extensions was not the same. English used verbs that already had a deontic meaning.

Thus, whether modals in a given language show polysemy or not may be

largely idiosyncratic. How-ever, the way polysemy develops and how the resulting modal meanings scopally interact is principled.

Languages may not all necessarily have grammatical modals, let alone polysemous ones. Yet, given the way polysemy arises diachronically, and works synchronically (if this account is on the right track), the correct scope/flavor correlations should be recoverable by the learner.

Thus modal auxiliaries show aspectual and temporal restrictions that are unexpected from their meaning alone, and what sets "grammatical" modality (expressed by modal auxiliaries) apart from "lexical" modality (expressed by verbs and adjectives). We will then be in a position to address the question of why languages differ in the polysemy status of their modal markers, and the implications of such a dichotomy for acquisition and diachrony.

List of literatures:

1. Алиференко Н.Ф. Спорные вопросы семантики. – Москва: Гнозис, 2005. – 112 с.

2. Абдуазизов А.А. и др.Общее языкознание. – Ташкент: НУУз, 2003. – 162 с.

3. Бархударов Л.С. Структура простого предложения современного английского языка. – Санкт-Петербург, Издательство: ЛКИ, 2008. – 200 с.

4. Беляева Е.И. Функционально-семантическое поле модальности в английском и русском языках. Воронеж, 1999. – 189 с.

5. Бондарко А.В. Теория функциональной грамматики. Темпоральность. Модальность. Ленинград, 1990. – 234 с.

6. Вейхман Г.А. Новое в английской грамматике. Москва, Высшая школа, 1996. – 128 с.

7. Воронков В.В. Прагматический аспект текста англоязычной публицистической журнальной статьи. Москва, 1991. – 98 с.