

FIKRAT JAHANGIROV

**THE INVESTIGATION OF MODALITY IN
GERMANIC PHILOLOGY AND TURKOLOGY**

**MINISTRY OF EDUCATION OF THE REPUBLIC
OF AZERBAIJAN**

AZERBAIJAN UNIVERSITY OF LANGUAGES

FIKRAT JAHANGIROV

**THE INVESTIGATION OF MODALITY IN GERMANIC
PHILOLOGY AND TURKOLOGY**

BAKU - 2006

Scientific editor: Akhundov A.A., Associate Member of Azerbaijan National Academy of Sciences, doctor of philology, professor

Reviewers: Gayibova M.T., Doctor of philology, professor
Gaziyeva M.Y., Doctor of philology, professor

Fikrat Jahangirov. *The investigation of modality in Germanic philology and Turkology. Baku – 2006.*

The monograph has been devoted to the investigation of the category of modality in germanic philology and turkology. This book will be extremely useful for linguists, teachers and students of the department of philology, for all the readers who was interested with the problems of general linguistics.

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION.....	4
CHAPTER I. GENERAL VIEWS ON MODALITY, ON ITS LOGI- CAL AND GRAMMATICAL ESSENCE.....	7
<i>1.1. The category of logical modality.....</i>	<i>18</i>
<i>1.2. Grammatical modality.....</i>	<i>22</i>
<i>1.3. Modality and the lexical meaning of the word.....</i>	<i>33</i>
CHAPTER II. THE INVESTIGATION OF MODALITY IN GERMA- NIC PHILOLOGY AND TURKOLOGY.....	34
<i>2.1. General notes.....</i>	<i>34</i>
<i>2.2. The investigation of modality in Germanic philology...</i>	<i>36</i>
<i>2.3. The investigation of the category of modality in Turkology.....</i>	<i>53</i>
<i>2.4. The investigation of the category of modality in the Azerbaijan linguistics.....</i>	<i>69</i>
CONCLUSION.....	77
REFERENCES.....	80

INTRODUCTION

Modality is a grammatico-semantic category expressing the attitude of the speaker to the expressed thought, the attitude of the thought of the speaker to the objective reality. As it has been pointed out in the dictionary called “*The Explanatory Linguistic Terms*” *The expressed thought can be used as real or unreal, possible or impossible, desirable or undesirable, necessary or unnecessary or as in the form of probability.* The conception of modality is expressed by the help of grammatical and lexical means (verb forms, modal words, intonation, particle)” (Adilov M, Verdiyeva Z, Aghayeva F, 1989, p.164).

The words, denoting the attitude of the speaker to the expressed thought or to some parts of the thought are characterized as modal words (Adilov M, Verdiyeva Z, Aghayeva F, 1989, p.164).

Prof. M.Husseynzadeh considers that modal words can be related to neither the main parts of the sentence, nor the secondary parts.

As to the author, though they have been derived from the main parts of the sentence, they have already lost their lexical meanings and carry out the function of the word giving modal meaning either to a part of the sentence, or to the whole sentence. At the same time professor M.Husseynzadeh considers modality as a logical - grammatical category either affirming or denying the reality, of the thought or the quality of a certain event or a thing (Husseynzadeh M., 1973, p.352).

As a grammatic category modality is the part of speech denoting the attitude of the speaker to the uttered thought in the process of speech. The attitude of the speaker can either belong to the whole thought or this or that part of the given thought. From the grammatical point of view the thought can have different features or directions. Having investigated the materials of different languages, the attitude of the speaker to the given thought can be determined as the followings:

- affirmative or negative modality;
- objective or the subjective modality;
- real or unreal modality;
- desirable or undesirable modality;

- true or untrue (false) modality;
- supposed or unsupposed modality;
- necessary or unnecessary modality;
- important or unimportant modality;
- time modality.

Besides the pointed out forms of modality some other sense groups of modality can be indicated:

- modality indicating certainty or uncertainty;
- definite or indefinite modality;

Modality denoting the expressiveness, increasing or decreasing the sense of the word.

The expression of subjective modality in the languages belonging to different systems is also rich.

Thus, subjective modality can be expressed by intonation, word order, synthetic repetitions, by the constructions denoting intensiveness and duration. But the main means causing the modal relations is considered to be the modal verbs.

Modal words are lexic-grammatical word groups denoting the attitude of the speaker to the given thought. It is impossible to relate them to a concrete part of speech. Nouns, adjective, verbs and other parts of speech denote the attitude of the speaker to the given thought from different aspects. The investigations show that in fact the expression denotes the same part of the speech from which it has been derived. So, we can say that here modalization is the process, appearing afterwards.

The modalized word groups lose all the “grammatical relations with the word groups that the once belonged to and acts in the sentence in different syntactic ampule. The grammatical features of the modal words that they have once referred to, remain unchanged. The grammatic valency features of the parts of speech are lost in the process of modalization. Unchangability, the “passive” attitude to the indications of grammatical links and attitudes are considered as the leading features of the modal verbs. Being the logical results the modal verbs can’t be a member of the sentence, but they denote an attitude to the whole sentence or to a part of it.

Within the sentence modal words more frequently are expressed by the intonation. When they are expressed the high rate of voice, tembre, tone, rithm change by intervals and by this way the attitude of the speaker to the given thought finds its reflection.

Modal words may perform different syntactic functions in the sentence:

- Can be as a parenthesis in the sentence;
- Word-sentence can be used as a speech dialogue;
- It serves as a connecter of independent sentences with a certain thematic topic within the borders of syntactic to wholes within the context. In these words, which act in connecting function, the subjective-modal direction undergo changes.

Thus the main features of modal words as a lexico-grammatical category, is by determined their semantic and subjective modal features, their morphological unchangability and by certain syntactical functions.

Modal words have acquired vertile features from the view points of stylistics. In the colloquial speech as well as in dialogues and in other types of the oral intercourse, modal words serve to operate some other stylistic functions.

One of the questions in the theoretical linguistics causing the arguments is the determination of inter layers' borders of modality in the language level. In the attitude to this question there are many sides casing arguments among the linguistics. Sometimes modality is equal to polisemantics or it is characterized as its one type, but sometimes, it is understood as the artificial transformation of the logical categories into linguistics. As it is known, the main features conditioning the modality with logics in comparison with reality, are caterogies of reality, necessity and possiblility.

But these mentioned above features do not involve the fields of semantic varieties and prove the affirmation of thoughts in natural languages. In other words in the process of the expression of words, sentences and phrases, and sentence constructions sentence diapazon is more environmental.

CHAPTER I.

GENERAL VIEWS ON MODALITY, ON ITS LOGICAL AND GRAMMATICAL ESSENCE

As the differences between the logical modality and the linguistic modality have not been exactly determined in many times, this question has been the topic of discussion. In the science of logics the logical characteristics of such modality has not been presented, so to say its status has not been determined in the framework of science of logics. We think that the formal-libguistic borders of linguistic are purely the problems of linguistics and they must be analysed within the framework of linguistics. In the field of modal logics created in accordance with the preparation of logical theory of modality it has to be taken the libguistics aspects of modality into consideration. In the science of modern linguistics one of the investigators of the theory of modality is Y.A.Slinin and it is the possiblility of meeting interesting thoughts in his investigation of modality (Slinin Y., 1967, 119-117).

Observations show that the first sentence becomes in the neutural position and content. In the following sentence in the expressed objective and subjective thoughts of the individual “man” are compared with “non-man’s” thoughts. The category of Modality first of all at the early stage, in the general sense, is being formulized in this condition. In the modality, which has found its existence in the deepest structure national and typological features are not reflected, more of the universal, all international features of the human intercourse, the features being common for all the human kind are combined in this category. In the further stages modality goes far away from the grammar norms and grammar rules and turns to the special syntactic means involving the varieties of subjective attitudes in itself. The role category of appreciation is also high in the formulation of modality. One of the important factors of linguistic modality theory is the subject of apreciation. The subject of appreciation preserves its relative stability in the different combinations of the object. In the texts reflecting different situations the subject of appreciation contains the subjective thoughts of the speaker formulated in syntactic constructions form the essence of

modality. The practical observations show that the attitude of the speaker to a certain object or to the uttered thought does not always remain unchangeable. In the process of historical development of the society, associated with the fundamental changes in the structure of the economic relations and in the content may change the attitude of the speaker to the uttered thought. Namely, Subjective appreciation and attitude is not in the form of stagnation nor is forever, it is the process undergoing the certain changes under the influence of certain changes.

Thus, any idea expressed in the language can find its real reflection, changing its meaning spectre which is suitable to the affirmation of the truthfulness of any modal meaning of any uttered thought. First of all this derives from the point that, even the attitude of the same subject to the same thought may change. Modality which is also one of the means of appreciating modality does not differ from anything in comparison with other means. Here can be drawn a result that it is not right to take modality in a syntactic form. Associated with the development of the personality and his/her formulation the content of modality can also be changed. If we accept this regulation, then “the objective modality” doesn’t go with the same frame of free changeable modality.

The determination of the linguistic borders of the modality is just as the same as giving its complete linguistic characterization and determination of its normal borders based upon its complete linguistic level and formal criterium.

For instance: the attitude of the speaker may be expressed in different ways, by gestures, emotional means, attitude based upon logical results, modal words and expressions etc. All this standards are the factors preventing from the determination of the linguistic borders of modality.

The observations gives us possibility conclude that function of the free subjective appreciation of the modality can also be replaced by the conjunctions and by modal particles. Apart from words they get into different contacts with words and express the features characteristic to modality. Conjunctions may successfully fulfill the function of appreciation of the attitude of the speaker to the uttered thought. They influence upon the different forms and structures of the coordination of the syntactic

units in the text, but they are apart from their ruling and conjuncting functions. This is characteristic with bearing semantic meanings of many of them.

The speaker depending on the rational appreciation or critical analysis chooses a certain conjunction. Even the intellectual characteristic does not belittle the subjectivism. In the semantics of the speaker either determined or hesitant, probable attitude finds its reflection. In many cases the attempts to appreciate the modality of the conjunctions are not obvious. In fact the differentiation or the union of different types of the members of the sentences, their type varieties are attained by the differentiation of the modal meanings of the conjunctions.

Modality is not a newly created phenomenon in the system of language. It is possible to meet the features characterizing modality in the specimens of Azerbaijanian folk literature, tales and sagas and in classic literature. The attitude of writer to this or that event is also obviously seen in resources on history, in chronicles written even in scientific style.

According to the types of meaning and their functions modal words consist of the unites performing logical-emotional and other different lexical-grammatical semantic functions. In the Azerbaijanian language the followings can be indicated as modal words. They are: *ehtimal ki* (probably), *shubhasiz ki* (certainly), *chox guman ki* (It's very likely), *aydindir ki* (It's clear that...), *gorunur* (It seems), *malumdur ki* (It is obvious that), *ola bilsin ki* (it may be), *yaqin* (surely), *balka* (may be), *deyasan* (It seems...), *nahayat* (at least), *dogrudan da* (really) etc.

These modal words referring to different members of sentences and to the whole sentences create rich shades of meanings in formulating the attitude of the speaker.

Modality is a living process always undergoing development and changes. Transformation of words into new modal words in the process of speech and their expression of modality is always observed. In this dialectical process the special increase of volume of modal words in word stock is going on by a rising line.

In the Azerbaijani language modal words are characterized as the followings:

a. Affirmative modal words: *albatta* (of course), *haqiqatan* (really), *shubhasiz* (undoubtedly), *dogrudan da* (truly), *shaksiz* (no doubt);

b. Completing modal words: *demali* (so), *gisasi* (briefly), *belalikla* (so), *umumiyyatla* (generally), *naticada* (as a result of...);

c. Modal words indicating probability: *balka* (may be), *yaqin* (surely), *ehtimal ki* (probably...), *guman ki* (supposing that...), *sanki* (as it), *ela bil ki* (as though).

According to the syntactic function a parenthesis and a word act in the function of a sentence (Adilov, Verdiyeva, Aghayeva, 1989, p.164).

According to the general nature modality is a complex logical-linguistic category created in the later level of the development of the process of intercourse. The complicated feature of modality lies in the fact that it has combined in itself all the features in all language levels, including the collection of grammatical, syntactical and semantic relations. As the product of the development of human mind modality also reflects the national self belongings. The element acts to lay a bridge between modality and phraseology. Leaving alone the language levels, its functional possibilities and means, the usage of modality in the phraseological expressions have been less investigated in the linguistic literature.

As it is clear there are many crossing each-other points in the content of the problems of language and mind with the science of logics and grammar. Just in this respect the linguistic essence of modality with the logical modality is being mixed up. Sometimes modality as a linguistic category is absolutely denied. Its logical essence is placed in the front line. And linguistic modality is sometimes considered as a form of expression of logical modality. It is necessary to mention that the category of modality can also be analysed from the point of view of philosophy. This category must be investigated on the background of reality and mutual relation of language and mind. On the indicated background logical modality can be characterized as the important feature of the sentence. Objective connections can be reflected in different forms and different grades in the content of logical sentence. According to these forms and grades sentences are divided into the possibility real and important types of the sentences. The content in the sentence can be as real or it may be supposed.

From the point of view of linguistics the characteristic features of modality have been above mentioned. Here the attitude of the speaker to the given thought has been

put in the first place. From this point of view the sides that bring linguistic modality with logical modality together are apparent.

As it is known linguistic reality, or unreality coincide with logical reality and untruthfulness. Here one more important point should be taken into consideration: the attitude to the uttered thought (its reality, unreality, truthfulness, lie, importance, necessity, significance, probability) is stated by the speaker and this attitude may be characterized as subjective and objective. Taking these features as granted many of the linguistics (Q.V.Kolshanski, V.V.Panfilov, L.V.Bondarenko) consider linguistic modality as the means of expression of logical modality (Kolshanski, 1961, p.94-94; Panfilov, 1977, p.48; 1971; 1982; Bondarenko, 1971). But there is no monolateral position among the linguists associated with this problem.

Like all other linguistic categories modality too is characterized by the content and expression plans. But modality is more characterized by the content plan and from this point of view it can be considered as a semantic category. If we take the plans of modality as the unity of content and expression of the content (the form) then it can be considered as both categories as semantic and grammatic-prosodic categories (Kolshanski, 1961; Petrov, 1982).

The investigators are right to mention that (see: Blokh, 1983) according to its linguistic nature modality can neither be purely social, nor purely individual category: Here we observe a paradoxal case: On one hand modality indicates the attitude of the speaker (a concrete individual taking part in the process of speech in certain situations) to the uttered thought, on the other hand as a means of expression of modality commonly used, already formulated lexical units are used. Namely, as the lexical units expressing the attitude, the attitude itself is already a social phenomenon. But the individual uses the language facts and the same social phenomenon in the process of speech. If modality were purely an individual category, then it would be impossible to understand it by language means. But an individual uses the volume of attitudes accumulated in the society by his/her own way. Just according to the indications both individual and social aspects of modality become apparent.

In general the explanation of modality in the linguistic literature is different. In the most generalized form such a determination shall be accepted that modality is the

attitude of the speaker to the reality. But in this determination there again exists a contradiction. When we mean reality objectively existing world is understood. It's natural that reality and objective world are not always and the same things. In other words the thoughts of the speaker about the objective existence, about the real word may be subjective, personal opinions.

One of the points causing arguments from the linguistic point of view is belonging of modality to the semantic and grammatical categories. O.S.Akhmanova in her "Dictionary of Linguistic Terms" explains modality on the background of the attitude of the speaker to what he/she says and the attitude of the speech to the reality of the content and indicates that modality can be expressed in different ways – in grammatical and lexical means. To such grammatical means O.S.Akhmanova indicates for example the mood of the verbs, the modal verbs, intonation and so on (Akhmanova, 1969, p.p.286-287).

G.V.Kolshanski in his turn considers the modality of sentences as a general semantic category. Modality is realized by the way of utterance and it refers to the whole utterance. The utterance can't be divided into two parts from the point of semantics. According to the content a sentence is complete. Semantics derives from modality and it is being realized in the process of communication (Kolshanski, 1961).

As to T.P.Lomptev modality as semantic, more exactly speaking, as semantic-communicative function may be relayed more to the logics. Modality spreads all through the sentence, but it has not a special way of expression (Lomptev, 1969).

Of course it is impossible to agree with this thesis. Both the lexico-grammatical and prosodic ways of expression of modality is known. Having dealt about this matter, there is no need giving further explanation about it.

As a semantic category modality can as well, be investigated as a new object of syntax (Galperin, 1974; Barkhudarov, 1974; Kats, Fador, 1963). In the derivative grammar books modality is considered as a conception of a deeper structure (syntax). According to the ideas of the investigators superficial structure does not fully explain the absolute essence of modality, because modality is a semantic category reflected in the deeper structure, in the semantic layer.

In the superficial structure the ways of expression of modality may be different. The expression of modality in any national language also may have various forms. In Russian modality is characterized from different view-points (See: Krushelnitskaya, 1961; Zolotova, 1962; Ermolayeva, 1976). The mentioned characterization has both similar and different features. Three types of modality are pointed out in the investigations of Khushelnitskaya, Zolotova and Yermolayev.

In the type called “objective reality” the suitability of the content of the uttered sentence is being expressed. In the type of subjective modality the attitude of the speaker to the content of the utterance is being expressed. Derivative type of modality has still complicated structure. Here the bearer of the sign indicates the attitude to the truthfulness of the contact between the subject and the predicate. The first two types, the third type is inter syntax type link. Some investigators express these analogical process by different from each-other conceptions. Here modality is divided into extra modality and internal modality. Extra modality reflects objective and subjective modality but internal modality expresses the attitude to the action expressed by the subject.

In the internal modality the attitude of the subject to the executed action in the plan of possibility, necessity, wish, importance is expressed.

In this framework by extra modality the attitude of the speaker to the executed action is expressed in the plan of the attitude to the utterance and the attitude to the content of the utterance is expressed.

In spite of the differentiation of the conceptions, generalizing the above mentioned we may come to the conclusion that modality in the most general sense is divided into two parts: objective and subjective modality.

Objective modality reflects the objective reality (truth). Subjective modality expresses the attitude of the speaker. In the subjective modality the belief (unbelief, non agreement with the uttered thought, agreement with the uttered word) finds its reflection.

In this process the speaker appreciates the expressed thought from the point of view of suitability or unsuitability of the expressed thought to the reality.

The division of modality into objective and subjective types have long been a target of argument and at present this argument is still going on. Objective reality reflects the characterization of the connections which exist objectively in the objective reality, but subjective modality is the reflection of objective reality in the mind of a concrete individual. From this point of view the reflection of the objective reality is always individual. Understanding is a creative process depending on the knowledge level of the concrete person, on his/her mode of logical psychological mind, his/her memory and on some other factors. The reflection of objective reality, its understandability can't be objective, it is always subjective.

Just relying upon these principles a group of investigators assume that the existence of objective modality is impossible. Modality can't be objective because social, collective attitude does not exist. It is true, that the volume of subjective attitudes of different individuals in the long run formulates the social opinion, and social attitude.

The above mentioned thesis show once more that as the objective and subjective modality conceptions are not explained on the background of the same principles and criteria they are still causing dispute. Our investigations carried out both on English and Azerbaijani materials give us ground to say that modality can be considered subjective according to the essence and nature of modality. But subjective modality in its turn is the result of reflection of objective reality in the human mind.

Many of the investigators consider that, in general there must exist modality for every utterance. Without subjective modality there can't be any utterance (Torsueva, 1975, p.38).

Thus, objective modality expresses the level of characterization of the attitude to the reality of the given information. Apart from this subjective modality expresses the attitude of the speaker to the expressed part of speech, or information.

On the relativity of the Objective-subjective meanings the attitudes of different investigators are different. The Objective-subjective modal meaning being in contact complete each-other. Subjective modality influencing the subjective modality it can't change the meaning of the modality but it can express this modal meaning in a

different way. The category of modality can be regarded as the dialectical unity of objective and subjective modality which finds its reflection in the human mind.

Objective and subjective modality can be characterized as the different parts of the inseparable one whole. Any information of the subjective modality does not consist of only information, but also the attitude of the speaker to the given information finds its reflection in this or that form.

Modality has two aspects – objective and subjective modality-completing each-other becoming as a whole they create the content of modality. Both aspects are valuable according to the load of meaning they possess.

The means creating modality establishing modal content are various. A group of investigators think that lexico-grammatical word-groups not expressing the meanings of interrogation, affirmative meanings, meanings of reality, unreality, groundlessness, doubtfulness, word-groups not causing arguments, probability, possibility necessity, wish and other shades of meanings belong to Modality (Admoni, 1955, p.63).

Other group of investigators include into modality notions such as reality, possibility, necessity (Kolshanski, 1961, p.98-99) other include affirmative, interrogative, imperative sentences into modality (Orepa, 1978, p.p.217-301).

According to another conception which has already been firmly accepted in linguistics, the words denoting sense and excitement are considered modal words. Sh.Balli thinks that any attitude of the speaker to the uttered thought is modality (Balli, 1955, p.p.43-45).

Those who accept this conception think that emotional-expressive expressions creating joy, sorrow, proud, anger, fear etc. are the means creating the modality.

But not all the scholars unanimously accept emotional-expressive means as the category of modality. The supporters of this ideology think that there is not any connection between modality and emotional-expressive means, and though they seem to be similar in some points, but they have different semantic functional features.

One of the interesting problems is to what level of language should modality belong to. Most of the investigators think that modality refers to the level of sentence. But the sentence itself can be completely explained in the context. Just taking this as a basis, we can say that it is more reasonable to analyse modality in a higher circle

than the sentence level and analyses it in the context level. If until now modality was investigated in a sentence level, at present text linguistics has begun developing rapidly, and it has given way to better understanding of many of new conceptions and categories. If we analyse modality in the level of text the explanation and acquisition of new shades of meanings become real. In the formulation of the category of modality, and modal background, communicative-modal elements play a significant role.

As it is known alongside with linguistic ways of expressions, a number of means extra linguistic elements take part in the process of communicative context and these features play a great role in the process of realization of the modal meanings.

Thus the category of modality becoming wider and wider transferring from the level of word into sentence and from the sentence level into context one.

One of the problems which causes arguments in linguistics is associated with relativity of modality with predicativity. Some of the investigators equalize the modality with predicativity, and consider the modality as a certain form of the predicativity of a sentence. There are also some those who characterize modality as the form of expression of the predicativity (Raspopov, 1957, p.191).

Another group of linguists do not deny the link of modality with predicativity but they don't consider modality as the means of expression of predicativity. In the investigations of this form modality is characterized as a wider category than the predicativity (See: Admoni, 1956; Shapiro, 1958, p.23).

We think that it is not correct to similarize modality with predicativity. Modality can't substitute predicativity, in other words modality can't perform the function predicative. Modality can bring different shades of meanings to the predicativity, can create semantic meanings in its content, can add features characters to the verb forms. In this respect modality sometimes becomes equalized with the verb forms. V.Panfilov characterizes modality as something logical-semantic category and indicates its belonging to the syntax. From this point of view modality is distinguished from verb forms. Though modality is characterized as a logical-semantic category, the verb forms are only grammatical-syntactic phenomenon.

According to V.Panfilov in grammar predicative can also be a predicate, modality can also be as well form of a verb (Panfilov, 1971, p.174).

The category of modality is separated into two types: real and unreal modality. It is considered that reality means confirmity to the reality but unreality (See: Gak, 1981; Zveryeva, 1983; Smirnitski, 1957; Yermolayeva L., 1962; Landvoort, 1966).

Like objective and subjective modality, this problem is too disputable. Some of the investigators oppose subjective modal meanings against real/irreal and do not refer it to any of them.

Like the complex logical-linguistic essence of modality the ways of its expression is also various. Sometimes linguists explain the ways of expression of the modality on the background of lexic grammatic field (Guluga, Shendels, 1967, .p.57-58).

The modal verb forms in English are expressed by means of parenthesis in the form of sentences, modal verbs + infinitive constructions, modal words etc.

Communicative modality is formed not only by the types of the sentences, by the verb forms, by lexic means, modal words but also by intonation, stress, different gestures etc.

The role of intonation and stress in the formulation of modality have been investigated by a number of linguists (Balli, 1961, p.56; Vinogradov, 1975, p.55-87).

In the frame work of modality exclamation expressed in this or that form of verb can be used in the vocative sentences. But in English the main ways of the means of expression of modality is the verb forms (Mood).

The means by which modality is expressed most of all is the level layer. The lexical layer is represented by all parts of speech. The words which establish this layer are called modal words. Besides modality is also expressed by the lexic-phraseological units too. In English modality is also formed by the modal verbs.

As a means of expression of modality L.D.Dolinskaya indicates lexic-frazeological forms, grammatical, lexical, and lexic-syntactic forms (Dolinskaya, 1976). In this classification intonation and stress have not been indicated. Nevertheless, as a means of forming modality G.A.Zolotova and V.V.Vinogradov have especially pointed out the importance of intonation-syntactic means (intonation, stress etc.).

As a result of above mentioned we may come to the conclusion that, both in the English and Azerbaijanian Languages the ways of expression of modality have not been discriminated in the most general forms. Modality is mainly derived from morphological, lexical, lexico-syntactical, lexico-phraseological, prosodical means. The difference between the Azerbaijanian and English Languages lies in the content of these means and in the differentiations of structural types.

As a functional-semantic category modality expresses the attitude of the speaker to the thought and reality. In this respect modality is the reflection of dialectical unity of objectivity and subjectivity in the human mind.

Modality is a logical-linguistic category being in close relationship with the expressions having the affirmative/negative, emotional-expressive meanings, predicativity, verb forms and mood. Linguistic modality consists of the total volume of real and unreal modalities.

Both in English and Azerbaijani Languages the structural and semantic investigation as a linguistic category creates the possibilities of explanation of the essence of modality in the languages of different systems, determination of universally general and different from each-other features.

1.1. The category of logical modality.

As modality reflects the attitude of the speaker in process of realization of a certain event it can be determined by the analyses in the link between logical subject and logical predicate too.

When we mean the modality of nay judgement we speak of the confirmity of the thing about which it is spoken in the judgement with the conception denoting it. The thought that modality is more objective and logical is being based upon. In other words, those who support the idea that modality has more logical characteristics without having linguistic features and that it can be explained from the logical point of view make attempts to substantiate this thesis by logical syllogisms. In logics judgements according to modality are characterized differently:

As to the objective modality: a) possibility; b) reality, necessity of judgements.

As to the logical modality: a) problematic; b) a group of real judgements (Sadikhov, 1962, p.128).

The probability of links and attitudes between the subject and predicate of the modal judgements are divided into three groups according to the necessity and real characters: 1) probable (problematic) judgements, 2) real (assertoric) judgements, 3) necessary (apodictic) judgements.

In the half of XIII century carrying out analysis from the point of the problems of the modal logics U.Sherwood indicated the following types of the modal judgements: real, untrue, probable, non-probable, occasional, necessary (see: Israfilov, 1987, p.161).

As M.Israfilov has pointed out the type and character of the relation and attitudes expressed in the judgements, the dependence of one judgement upon the other, the time aspect among the events in the judgements, place and other dependences are reflected in the additional judgements are considered modal judgements.

The modality of the judgements is aimed at giving revealed or unrevealed additional information about the sentences, the judgements reflecting objective characteristics between their features, the character feature of substantiating the dependence on the types between the subject and the predicate reflected in the judgement. The author thinks that modal criteria are the investigation of the additional levels to discover the mutual relations and mutual influences in the logics by the help of group conceptions (Israfilov, p.161).

In the possibility judgements in the subject and predicate the relationship between the events is given as probability: “S” probably is Subject and “P” probably is Predicative. The relationship reflected between these events base upon certain objective possibilities.

In the reality judgements the links between the thing and events existing in real life is attracted as a real link between the subject and the predicate. The general formula of these judgements is “S – P”. The reality judgements reflect the ties between the thing and the events not for the reason why these ties exist but reflect them as they exist in real life.

In the judgement of necessity the links of the events are reflected mostly in a general way. By the help of these judgements we express the most general laws, regulations, rules and so on. The general formula of these judgements is: “S necessarily is P (is not “P”)”.

The Problematic judgements are used to investigate this or that feature of the events, not existing in the objective reality but the events to be supposed to occur. The formula of the problematic judgements is: “S may be is P (it is not P)”.

Real judgements are the judgements convincingly affirming the truth or the lie or deny them. The formula of the real judgements is: “S is P (not P)”.

Logical necessity is the judgement proved by revealing the necessary essence of the objective laws of the truth of the judgements.

In the logical possibility judgements facts can only be proved by the means of logics. Unless the affirmation or negation belonging to the object of our thought in our judgements has been proved in practice, unless it is supposed by the logical means, they are called logical possibility judgements.

There are such events in nature, in life the existence, the occurrence of which are impossible. The judgements which are considered as logically impossible are of great importance in the process of thinking. In the judgements attained by means of logics are reflected.

According to the types of the logical relations judgements can be divided into the following groups: a) resolute judgements; b) conditional judgements; c) affirmative judgements; d) connecting judgements.

Resolute judgements are divided into the following groups: a) mono-compositional subjective and predicative resolute judgements; b) complex-compositional judgements.

The general formula of the mono-compositional subjective and predicative resolute judgements is “S is P”. In these judgements either the volume of predicate in the subject, or the volume of the object in the predicate is revealed: “S – A, B, V, G etc.”; “A, B, V, G etc. S”.

The logical essence of the conditional judgements is divided into the following groups depending on the relation of the subject and predicate in them:

a) in the conditional judgements affirmation or negation has conditional character, more correctly speaking, it depends on a certain condition upon the composition of that judgements;

b) in the conditional judgements conditionality enters the judgement as one of the unseparable elements of their subjects;

c) in the conditional judgements the relationship of the result with the condition about the knowledge is conveyed within the judgement beforehand. Conditional judgements also gives knowledge about the relationship between the condition and the result.

In the affirmative judgements several features to be belonged to a certain feature either is affirmed or denied. In other words in the collection of features to be belonged to an event or an object one refers to it. The collection of all the features are not enumerated to in order to have full information about the object which is being talked about.

The formular of the affirmative judgement is thus: “Or A or B or C is P”, “S or A, or B, or is C”.

In the connecting affirmative judgements the subject divided into several groups do not reject each-other, they are crossed with each-other, and refers in the same degree to the other element of the judgement.

The general formular of these judgements is: “S – (A, or B, or C) is P. (is not P) “or” “S – (A, or B, or C...) is P (is not P)”.

The formular of the judgement of rejecting affirmative is like this: “Only one part of “S” and S is P or S – P, contains only one part of P P”.

In the uniting judgements several simple judgements unite. And this union is created as a result of logical consecutiveness. There are two types of these judgements:

a) Conjunctive (poli-predicated) judgements. The formular of such judgements is like this: “A is both B and C”. These judgements are complicated for the reason that its subject is characterized by completely different with each-other predicates;

b) Capulative (poli-subjected) judgements are indicated with the formular “A and B is C”. Here on subject characterizes two subjects.

Conjunctive-Capulative (poli-predicted and poly subjected) judgements have the form like this: “A and B is both and D” (Sadikhov, 1962, p.p.136-139).

From what we have already mentioned above we can come to the conclusion that modality being a universal category can be explained by the aspects of linguistics, logics, philosophy and physics.

On the other hand in order to explain the complete essence of modality it is important to explain its functions and means of expressions in different fields of science.

1.2. Grammatical modality.

As we have already mentioned, in spite of the fact of having different language materials on modality, up to now the category about which we deal has not been given a thorough linguistic analysis. In spite of the fact that many linguists have made attempts to explain modality from the point of linguistics in the long run they have led their way to logics. In the end the borders of logical modality is mixed up with the linguistic modality. Modality is more characterized as the category reflecting the attitude of the speaker to the given thought in a wider plan (See: Vinogradov, Zolotova, Kolshanski, Panfilov, Petrov, Shredovo and others).

Taken in the wider context by means of language a certain information is given about the world encircling us (affirmative, negative, probable, special, etc.)¹ In the delivery of this information modal lexics, the mood of the verbs, the verb forms, information etc. can be important factors. In many languages the connection of the verb forms with modality is not accepted and mood (verb forms) is characterized as non-modal category.

The attitude of the speaker to the uttered thought is associated with condition, social norms, the knowledge environment of the individual and on some other factors. These indicated norms are more expressed by the mood of the verbs (imperative, wish, condition, necessity, etc.). It is worth mentioning that these features can be related to all the languages of the world. But the appearance of modality and the ways of their expression in different languages are different.

Besides these pointed out forms in linguistics there exists so called temporary modality form as well. It is a known fact that temporary modality has also grammatical and lexical ways of expression.

Modality has such components in which the attitude of a person to the uttered thought appears in the form of mood, wish, condition etc. The modal features of the mood has not always been taken into consideration. This is the fact indicating that modality has not been fully formulated as a category, and this is associated with the determination of its object. But the investigations carried out on the basis of the materials of the languages having different systems show that modality is a universal language category.

One of the means playing an important role in the forms of modality is intonation. In Phonology as an intonation unit different terms are used; intoneme, prosodeme, a second (repeated) phonem, supersegment phonem etc. During the latest scientific literature the term "*intoneme*" is more frequently used. Intoneme can be experimentally explained in the phoneme system of languages having different systems. Intoneme can be regarded as an intonation model determining the sentence semantics.

In the scientific literature intoneme is divided into intellectual and emotive types (See: Desheriyev T.I., N.Y., 1987, ¹ 1). According to the communicative purposes the comparison of the sentences serves to discriminate affirmative, interrogative, imperative and exclamatory sentences. Besides, in the process of information splitting the phases into important informative units is also carried out by intellectual intonemes. One of the means of subordination ties is considered intellectual intonemes too. They have got the possibilities to establish communications among the active members of the sentences.

As it is know Both in Into-European languages and in Turkish languages in the sentences of communicative type alongside with lexic-grammatic means intonation is also used. In interrogative and in declarative sentences the role of intonation is still higher. Intonation is one of the important factors in the expression of predicatively. Communicative intoneme together with formulating the structure of the sentence it turns into a means creating predicativity.

The actual articulation of sentences represents itself differently in different languages of different systems. If in the agglutinative languages special morphological indications play an important role in the formulation of intonation in the fleective languages intonation also carries out the function of morphological indications. For example, in the Azerbaijani language *-m9*, *-mi*, *-mu*, *-mü* are the particles having the capability to activize this or that member of the sentences.

In the analytic languages alongside with the separation of the predicate and articulation with a special stress, modal words are also used. Such modal words simultaneously with articulation activise this or that member of the sentence: *perhaps* – “*ola bilsin ki*,” *possibly* – “*mumkundur*”, *probably* – “*ehtimal ki*,” *evidently*, *obviously* – “*yaqin ki*,” *of course* – “*albatta*”, *surely* – “*shubhasiz, albatta*”, *no doubt* – “*shubhasiz*”, *in fact* – “*faktiki olaraq*”, *in truth* – “*haqiqatan*”, *naturally* – “*tabii ki*,” *etc.* Besides the modal words the splitting – limiting particles one also active in the process of articulation.

Thus modality can be looked upon as a lexic-grammatical category characterizing certain communicative purposes. The links between subject and predicate is being completed by the construction of a sentence, which it its turn attracts a certain attitude of the speaker to the given information. From this point the separation of modality to the objective and subjective points are relative. In all cases the element of subjectivity in modality presents itself.

The structural-semantic field of the linguistic modality can be described as in the following formular: $MSS = A \wedge (A_1 \vee A_2 \vee A_3)$.

Here “A” is the sign of logical communication, V is the sign of logical disjunction. It is necessary to mention that in this case in any sentence accordingly (A) class element must obligatorily exist. (A) carries out the function of the main means, supplying communicative structure in subject-predicate connections.

If any member building up a sentence is true, the disjunction in the above-mentioned formular is also true. In this formular (A₁), (A₂) are different frame each-other moduces, but these moduces do not exclude each-other and can be used simultaneously (Desherieva T.P. p.41) for ex.: *Yaqin burada mashin saxlamaq qadagandir* (Surely, it's forbidden to park a car here). In this sentence *yaqin ki*

(*surely*) and *qadagandır* (*is forbidden*) lexemes are included into (A₁), (A₂) moduses. One of the main means making up modality in the languages of different systems is the mood of the verbs, because the attitude of the speaker or the writer to the meaning of the information finds its reflection by the Mood of the verbs. This means that the whole level of linguistic modality is involved by the Mood of the verbs.

The followings shall belong to the mood playing important role in the formulation of modality on the materials of different languages: 1) Imperative Mood; 2) Affirmative Mood; 3) Negative Mood; 4) Interrogative Mood; 5) Exclamatory Mood; 6) Conditional Mood; 7) Concessional Mood; 8) Probability Mood; 9) Necessity Mood; 10) Suppositional Mood; 11) Potential Mood; 12) Obsentive Mood (non-witness of the action); 13) Forbidding Mood; 14) Permitting Mood etc.

As it is known not all above mentioned Moods have been indicated in all the languages and in the same level. For example, in the Azerbaijanian language the Mood are the following: 1. The imperative Mood; 2. The indicative Mood; 3. The Necessity Mood; 4. The Suppositional Mood; 5. The obligatory Mood; 6. The Conditional Mood; 7. The Common Mood (the ability mood, the interrogative mood); (See: M.Huseynzadeh, *Modern Azerbaijan Language, Morphology*, III part, Baku, "Maarif", 1973, p.p.207-229). Besides infinitive can also might be added into this list.

Modality can be expressed by lexic, syntactic, morphological and phonetic means. As in the predicative mood the speaker gives the description of the objective reality such modality can be characterized as modal truthfulness. Taken in the wider plan predicativity in comparison with other types of mood can be considered as neutral. In the indicative mood the events happening in present, past and future, either are denied or affirmed. Here the fact of happening of the event is reflected as something real, and the emotional-personal attitude of the speaker to the fact finds its expression. In other words the indicative Mood according its content may be considered as objective. In the indicative mood any person describes any occurrence as a fact, objective reality, but in the necessity mood not the fact, but on the background of the speaker's attitude reality is being explained.

In the attitudes of linguists being busy in the investigation of both Indo-European and Turkish languages there are close views in this problem (See: Peshkovski, 1950, Guliga, Natanzon, 1956; D.A.Shteling, 1959, Ler Crosse Duden, 1959; J.Erben 1958, E.Kreynovich, 1958; Direnkova, 1941; Kononov, 1956; K.Musayev, 1964 etc.).

It is necessary to mention that it is impossible to agree with the thesis that the category of predicativity reflects the objective reality as it is, without having any subjective attitude. The appreciation of the situation of the speaker on the occurrence can't be the same as with the factual reality itself.

The speaker can assume his thoughts within his/her own world outlook, education and knowledge level on the occurrences. The situation which is considered absolutely objective by the speaker, in fact is nothing more than the subjective explanation of the occurrence. The reality considered by the speaker in fact is not reality of the objective reality. The situation which we think as an objective reality and events are not explained in the same way by the speakers. In fact the subjective explanation of the occurrence has been put forth as an aim beforehand. An idea can be formulated by the speaker that his description of this or that phenomenon is objective. But by the appreciation of the same phenomenon by a specialist it may become clear that the description of the phenomenon by the speaker bears subjective character. Taking this as a thesis we can come to the conclusion that we must be careful while speaking of the objectivity of the indicative Mood, namely, this objectivity itself is relative. The speaker attempts to give confirmation to the reality of the fact he is describing as much as it is possible, but these attempts do not result with successes.

Just on this point of view some scholars consider the indicative mood as a grammatic form, serving to give information about the happening of the event. As to them the indicative Mood changes according to the person and number and modality meaning shades are very weak in them. That's why, it is not possible to characterize it as one of the moods. One of the main supporters of this thesis is S.Jafarov and he considers modality only as a subjective category and he doesn't take into consideration the Aspect of object of the Mood (S.Jafarov, 1963, p.29).

If we approach the problem from this point of view we must accept the utterances of the speaker on the occurrences as the utter reflexion of the reality which is impossible. In all variants the speaker describes the objective reality on the level that he understands the objective world and in conformity with his world outlook and education. Namely, here subjective factor must be taken into consideration.

Thus, speaking on the essence of the indicative mood, we must mention that, here modality is in close relationship with the subjective thoughts of the speaker.

Different assumptions of the indicative mood is associated with the fact that it has not its own morphological features (markers). In the Turkish languages the tense forms indicating past, present and future tense forms are also considered the formal markers. Analogical cases are observed in other languages of different from English language system. The category of predicativity is a category expressing reality, truthfulness and modality. Reality and truthfulness can exist only in the frame of time. Proving the reality of the information, we at the same time happen to affirm in reality the occurrence in the existing limit of time.

The absence of morphological features in the indicative mood can be characterized as a zero indication. In the other mood forms of the verbs attitude to the real object is expressed on certain suffixes. This suffix in most cases states a negative feature. As there is not such a formal indication in the Indicative Mood both real and unreal facts can be explained. In the Azerbaijanian Language.

There are morphological markers of obligatory, necessity, suppositional, conditional imperative moods. They can be related not to the real facts but to the ideal facts. Even in the cases when they are used in the past tense having the past tense suffixes they still possess the future meaning. Such a feature shows itself in the Indicative Mood. In the indicative mood in the attitude to reality or unreality a certain neutrality is felt. If in the other forms of the Mood the absence of morphological indications is a sign to the non-reality of the occurrence, absence of any grammatic features in the indicative mood can be explained as its involving both real and unreal contents. So, zero suffix, namely the absence of the suffix is apparent in comparison with other forms of the Mood and it turns to the indicator of the modal neutrality of this form.

The modal neutrality of the indicative Mood can undergo certain changes under the influence of subjective modality of other forms of modality. Sometimes this influence serves to still more strengthening of the modal neutrality, but sometimes it changes the information of the speaker from reality into unreality.

For example, if in the Azerbaijanian Language the modal expression “*hech shubhasiz*” still more strengthens the reality on which it is spoken, in this position by the usage of the modal word “*gorunur*” we may have created the motives of doubt, unbelief to the truthfulness of the given information. For example *Gorunur onun galishi choxunu mayus etdi* (**Undoubtedly** his coming saddened many of them, **May be** his coming saddened many of them).

The indicative mood used with different modal words gives proper meanings to the other forms of the verbs and this is crowned with the approach of moods semantically. In fact, the indicative mood which has to reflect more real attitudes used with modal words “*ehtimal ki*” (*probably*), “*mana ela galir ki*” (*It seems to me*), “*ola bilsin ki*” (*It may be*), “*guman ki*” (*supposing*) etc. changes and acquired the meanings close to the modal expressions. The modal functions of the indicative mood can also be attained by the help of particles, stress and intonation Analogical case presents its in the German Language as well. By means of different modal words and by the help of stress the modal meaning of the indicative mood changes and it acquires a wider sense. As a result of this the real reflection of the reality by a result of subjective transformation it can attain the following enumerated meanings:

- probability, possibility, doubt, interrogation;
- suggestion, convincing, order, etc.

In the German Language the indicative mood only in the neutral contextual contexts reflects the truth as reality, namely in the texts of this type subject is not noticeable. For the realization of this meaning a special attempt is not needed. The description of the objective reality can be intensified by the help of lexical-grammatical means.

Thus, we may come to the conclusion that the expression of the modal meaning of the Indicative Mood have a number of features both in Indo-European and Turkish Languages. The Azerbaijanian language according to these features is different from

many of the Turkish languages. In the German language there are no differences among the tense forms of the Indicative Mood, according to the modality features, they are homogenous. In the Azerbaijan Language this or that lexical means establishing the Indicative Mood have many features in the modal plan and separately can be analysed.

In the Azerbaijanian language the Indicative Mood from the point of time, is very rich. One of the specific features is that time and type alongside with indicating the relations, without any modal word, they can express modality by their own morphological structures. Sometimes contradicting each other tense forms, forming relative pairs on the tense platness express two different subjective modality, real objective modality and doubt, probability, unbelief.

The Modal tense essence of these forms does not change at this time and this form remains in the form of Indicative Mood. But this modality is accompanied purely by the different shades of the subjective modality. This subjective modality is not attained by the modal words and modal means, but they are attained by the proper verb forms on the background of a certain context. At this time by the help of forms of tense being in semantic contradictions, they express objective real modality and doubt, probability, uncertainty shades of meanings of the subjective modality. But this time their main functions – modal-tense essence is not lost and they remain to be used in the function of Indicative Mood of the verb. The Subjective shade of meaning is attained not by the help of modal words or lexical units but by the help of certain verb forms within the context.

In the Azerbaijan Language the pairs forming semantic contradictions are called “*shuhudu kechmish*”, “*naqli kechmish*”, “*gati galacak*”, “*qeyri-qati galacak*”, “*bitmish*” and “*bitmamish kechmish*”. These tense forms indicating the imporativeness or non-imperativeness of the action or showing whether the action has taken place by the witness of somebody or whether it is narrative action taking place in the past, they keep the subjective shades of meanings in them.

For example, the inevitability or the probability of the action to be taken place being informed by the speaker, the speaker formulates his thoughts either in the imperative future or in the indefinite imperative future tenses: “*Sabah man Siza*

galaram” (*I am supposed to come to you*) if in this sentence there is probability, uncertainly, in the sentence “*Sabah man Siza galacayam*” (*I shall come to you tomorrow*) there is obligation, certainly. These shades of meanings are obvious.

The thought of “expression of subjective shade of meaning” has been proved on the materials of Indo-European Languages. In the German language the I and the II person forms of the verbs express the meaning of modal probability. Thus, though in German “**Futurum I**” expresses future tense, when referred to the present tense, it expresses the shades tense, it expresses the shades of meaning of probability. But “**Futurum II**” in German, denoting the future tense when related to the past it expresses the meaning of probability. It’s necessary to note that this form is frequently used in Germanic languages. That’s why this form is often considered to be a special verb form giving the meaning of probability.

H.Brinkman does not consider “**futurum**” a future tense in German. He indicates that, the “**futurum**” tense form takes place in the locality of the event which is described by the speaker, namely here in fact tense is determined by the speaker. Just according to these principles Brinkman considers “**futurum**” as “**waiting mood**” of the verb (Moduder Erwartung) (Brinkman, 1962, p.325).

In French in the tense of the Indicative Mood there are forms having modal essence. In French, when *futur* denotes past indefinite tense this form coincides with *passé composé*. The difference is not in the tense form, it is determined by the imperativeness and non-imperativeness. When *futur antérieur* form refers to the Past Indefinite Tense it denotes obligation or probability (Martemyhanov, 1958, p.15).

But the means of expression of the past tense when being referred to the future tenses they stir unsuitability. In such situations *futur antérieur* loses its capability to express tenses and *passé composé* form of the verb can only be discriminated for its modal features. The shades of meaning of probability of this form presents itself. A number of investigators consider this form as a special verb form called *suppositif* (Martemyhanov, p.15).

During the last years in the linguistics of the text the subjective factors draw attention in the establishment of the text. In this respect the ideas of S.Ballin, E.Benvenist, V.Matezeinseen, V.V.Vinogradov and others are very interesting. The

example the expressions such as “*as it is known*”, “*of course*”, “*really*”, “*as though*”, “*very likely*” undoubtedly and others cause interest as the means of formulating the subjective attitudes.

Generally the to binary features of the modal words are admitted by everybody. Namely, in any sentence in the attitude of the speaker to the utterance there exists certainly and uncertainty of the speaker. Just according to this criterium all the modal words are classified. Such a semantic field is described that one pole stands certainty, but on the other pole stands probability, uncertainty, hesitation. All the modal words can be placed between these two poles.

If by the words being nearer to the pole of certainty, utter certainty is expressed, in the process of getting further from the certainly pole the meaning of uncertainty, probability increases. As it is known in all the sentences modal words are used. In this respect arises such a question: Which are the situations conditioning the usage of the modal words? When are the usage of the modal words are obligatory?

In the ordinary descriptive texts objective reality is described by the artistic characters and here the speech of the author, his explanation is needed.

In the texts in which the author’s interference, his personality is participating, there arises the necessity of the usage of the modal words.

In the presentation of the author the position of the author, his attitude to the personages finds its reflection. In such instances, in order to draw the attention of the reader, the usage of necessarily modal expressions makes the presentation of the author more vivid, attractive and convincing. The writer author directly expresses his subjective-modal attitudes from his own imagination. At this time the text is characterized by the measure of appreciation of the events by the author. Sometimes a rejime of dialogue is created between the author and his personages, the people he addresses to. Here in the frame of dialogue modal attitudes are being revealed.

Modal words are used mainly for the unreliable effects of the facts. In this case the author uses in his speech the following expressions: “*probably*”, “*surely*”, “*It is impossible that*” etc.

In the text of the author sometimes there is a short explanation. In the process of description of this or that event the author instanlly gives his explanation, then again

the author without the presence of his personality the description of the events continues.

So, the modal words included into the speech of the author play a kind of role to express the authors attitude to this or that character, to the events described in the text by the author's "I". This is important to clarify one of the functional aspects of the modal words.

The issues of relations of the modality of the sentence (affirmative, interrogative, negative, imperative and so on meanings) with the actual articulation causes great interest.

For example, "*O maktaba getdi*" (*He went to school*). If we use this sentence in the interrogative form it will be: "*O hara getdi?*" (*Where did he go?*). Here "*hara*" (*where*) being an interrogative pronoun creates such an idea beforehand that, that person (*who is being spoken about*) must go somewhere. In this concrete example the word "*hara*" (*where*) is substituted by the word "*maktab*" (*school*). In the sentences of this type modal interrogation is being observed. Interrogation stands beyond the borders of modality in the sentence. From the point of actual articulation "*O getdi*" (*He went*) theme, but "*hara*" (*where*) is rheme. Here rheme can be analysed in the modal frame. In the indicated examples rheme expresses the content of the assertive part of the utterance, but the theme expresses the content of presupposition.

So, the indicated type of the sentence can be considered as two modalled utterance: presuppositional has been established from the affirmative modality (*O getdi*) (*he went*) and by a special modality (*hara*) (*where*).

In the investigated sentence "*hara*" (*where*) interrogation demands in answer the informative neuclear. Taken as a whole the sentence establishing structural-semantic perfectness is formulated in the answer to the question "*hara*" (*where*) and It is sure to have carried out a certain purpose. Semantically this sentence can be devided into the following components: "*O hara isa getmalidir*" (*He must go somewhere*). There is detailed, convincing information beforehand. The Interrogative Pronoun *hara?* (*where*) serves to attain this exact and convincing information.

So, in this sentence double modality on the background of modality iearchy presents itself. Both modalities are in the affirmative forms. The difference lies in the

tense belongings. One of them is known beforehand, but the second is affirmed in the form of answer to the given question.

Presupposition enters into the rheme part of such type sentences and that itself does not involve the perfect content of the rheme. In the complete sentence the syntactic links between theme and rheme are apparently. In most cases such a relation function is carried out by the anaphoric element.

Anafore can be created by both lexic and grammatical means and also by the means of actual articulation. By the help of the actual articulation the modal frame transfirs on to the informative part of the sentence. And the rest of the sentence acts as the repetition of the affirmation of the previous sentence.

1.3. Modality and the lexical meaning of the word.

Actual articulation referring to the lexic meaning of one word in the sentence may actualize it. For example: "*Ali ushag deyil*" (*Ali is not a child*). In this sentence the meaning "*ushag deyil*" (*is not a child*) gives the meaning of "*boyukdur*" (*is grown up*). The rest of the components establishes presupposition and is used in the following meanings (*boyuk, mustagil, haddi-buluga chatmish va s.*) (*grown up, independent, teen-ager etc.*). Hence in this sentence modality lies more on the predicate component, and it does not involve the subject component of that component. The same component in the next stage carries out a predicate component function. Such an ierachy of the component structure of the meaning of the noun is conditioned by the anaphoric link between the theme and the rheme. The anaphoric link of components conditioning the meaning of the noun beforehand conditions, which of the word in the composition of the sentence shall be presupposition. It is necessary to note that in any noun used in this or that function in the sentence there is thematic part (presupposition, hidden anaphore). This feature is oftener felt in general-type sentences more obviously.

CHAPTER II.

THE INVESTIGATION OF MODALITY IN GERMANIC PHILOLOGY AND TURKOLOGY

2.1. General notes.

Before speaking in the investigation of modality in German study and Turkological literature let's regard some general features. As it is known both in German study and in Turkology modality is met with the same understanding. Such a general thesis has been formulated in linguistics that the speaker expresses his objective and subjective attitude to the expressed thought. In the world linguistics modality is explained as grammatical-semantic category. From this point of view, both grammatical and semantic functions of modality can be investigated on different levels and under the different angles of view. Any thought or utterance according to its content and meaning may be real (unreal), possible (impossible) desirable (undesirable), necessary (unnecessary) inevitable (non inevitable), true (untrue) probable etc. These features can be expressed by different means or ways. According differ from the Indo-European Languages. These mentioned features have also found their reflections in the explanation of modality as a logical-grammatical category.

In the formation of modality grammatic-lexic expressions participate. In this characteristic feature Germanic Languages have similar features with Turkish languages. The verb forms linking with suffixes of time and person form predicates with modal meanings. The role of modal words in the formation of modality issues are explained differently in different languages.

Different forms of intonation is the means conditioning the formation of different forms of objective and subjective modality and its usage in different semantic shades of meanings. By the help of the intonations of interjections, informative intonation, interrogative intonation and others, various semantic and grammatic forms of modality seen to have been established.

Participation of different grammatical means in the creation of modality sometimes leads to confusion. As it is known both in German and in Turkish

Languages modality is being created in this or that form by the following grammatical means: *modal words, particles, interjections, parenthesis, lexical repetitions, intonations, word order, interrogative forms etc.*

Sometimes the conception of modality is mixed up or is made similar with the grammatical means making up the modality. As a result of this modality as a grammatical-semantic category is not explained truly.

The confusion of modal words with modality is also observed in the investigations of this type.

Modal words is a part of speech expressing the attitude of the speaker to a certain event conception or thought. That's why a reperate place should be given to the modal words in the branch of morphology dealing with the parts of speech, its place and linguistic function among the parts of speech and its status should be determined.

According to the syntactic role modal words are similarized with the parenthesis and word-sentences too. In fact, modal words can be used in a sentence as a parenthesis in the syntactic function.

In many of the investigations modality is explained as a purely - linguistic category. In the introduction of the dissertation modality has been explained as both linguistic and logical category, its scientific essence has been revealed. The investigation of modality is not only important from the linguistic point of view, but also from the point of view of the logical category. First of all modality is a universal category. That's why a through investigation of the theory of modality makes it possible to analyse one more interesting feature of the logical category of modality - the emotional means of its expression, which can be considered as one of the optimal ways of learning the working mechanisms of human mind as a whole.

The investigation of modality in both Germanic and Turkish Languages have been carried out on the same scheme. Depending on the concrete language materials, language situations, on the means of expression and functions of modality in these taken separate languages, the directions of these investigations have been different from each other too.

For example, in the Germanic Languages, the functional-semantic field conception of modality, the role of modal words in building up a text, analytic and synthetic means of the expression of modality, the semantic nature of the modal particles, the issues of actual articulation have been the objects of investigations. But in the Turkological literature more of the verb forms and moods, modal words, syntactic repetitions and the types of intonation in the formulation of modal conceptions and their role in the expression of modality have been widely investigated.

As to the investigations of the German linguist L.M.Kanner in the Germanic linguistics the lexical means of expression of the modality have not been studied for a long time. Only modality created by the verb forms has been investigated. So in the German language investigations have been carried out only in the field of modal verbs (Kanner, 1953).

But in the Azerbaijanian Language modal words have been put in the first place for the investigation, and the modality of verb forms has begun to be investigated later on.

Further on R.Grosse criticized the previous investigators for associating the category of modality only with modal verbs and considered it necessary to learn the other lexical-grammatical means of expressing modality too.

2.2. The investigation of modality in Germanic philology.

The information on the main directions of the study of the category of modality in German study has been mentioned above. It is necessary to note that lexical means of expressing modality is notable with its specific features. For example, As it is known in English *can* (could), *may* (might), *must*, *ought*, *need*, *should*, *shall*, *will*, *would*, *dare* are called modal verbs.

These verbs are used to denote that the meanings used by the notional verbs express the action as possible, impossible, obligatory, important, advisable, doubtful etc. Among them the most active one being the modal verb *can* expresses physical ability, capability and possibility or impossibility of the action depending on the situation, forbiddance and permission. When the modal verb *must* is used with the

infinitive it states the obligatory character of the action and also it expresses order or advice. The verb *may* used with infinitive expresses the meaning of permission. Just the same verb used in “Simple infinitive” and “Perfect infinitive” denotes the meaning of imagination and assumption. The modal verb *should* expresses moral debt, advice, the action execution of which is obligatory or is not obligatory. The modal verb *ought* also gives the meanings expressed by *should*. Modal verb *shall* is used to know the opinion of the person being addressed to, it is also used to express the meanings of order, warning and promise. In the modal meaning *will* expresses intention request, wish and promise. The modal verb *dare* gives the meaning of having the courage to do smth. Modal verb *need* when used in the modal meaning expresses necessity is most of all used in negative and interrogative sentences (See: Rahimov, Hifayetzadeh, 1966, p.p. 159-167; Rahimov, Hidayatzadeh, Mirjafarova, 2001, p.p.75-79).

In the Azerbaijan language the analogical function is carried out by the affirmative modal words such as *albatta (of course)*, *haqiqatan (really)*, *dogrudan (truly)*, *shubhasiz (certainly)*, *shaksiz (undoubtedly)*, by the concluding words *demali (hence)*, *gisasi (briefly)*, *belalikla (so)*, *umumiyyatla (generally)*, *naticada (consequently)*, by the words denoting probability *balka (perhaps)*, *yaqin (surely)*, *deyasan (it may be)*, *ehtimal ki (probably)*, *guman ki (supposing)*, *sanki (as if, as though)*, *ela bil ki (as though)* etc. lexical units.

But grammatically modality is expressed both by verb forms and the moods.

The situation investigated on the materials of the two concrete languages (English and Azerbaijan) in the family groups of the languages into which the languages (Germanic and Turkish languages) are included, is repeated in different variants.

In the Germanic group of languages different investigators have explained modality in different from each-other aspects. V.Admoni (1956, 1969); Sh.Balli (1965, 1961); V.Gak (1981); M.Grepa (1978); E.Guliga, E.Shendels (1969); L.Ermolayeva (1962, 1976); E.Zveryeva, K.Krushelnitskaya (1961); O.Moskalskaya (1978); V.Panfilov (1971, 1977, 1992); N.Petrov (1982); A.Smirnitski (1957); Blokh (1983); Zandvoorf (1961); Kats Fodor (1963); Zommerfeldt (1988); Brinkmann

(1962); Bondarenko (1978, 1981); V.Gurevich (1959); E.Guliga, M.Natanzon (1956); D.Shteling (1959); Y.Erben (1958); S.Borkachov (1976) and many others, have carried out investigations in the field of discovering the linguistic, logical, philosophical essence of modality on the ground of German, English and also a little of Romanic group of languages.

In the German study the investigation the analytic and synthetic ways of expressing, modality is one of the important issues, solution of which is considered to be one of the very important problems. It is necessary to note that this problem being a linguistic one also bears philosophic-logical characteristics. On the background of this conception lies the choice of investigation of the object of modality on the level of sentence.

The determination of the types of modal meanings from the point of the problem of sentence modality is very important. The analysis of a modal sentence shows that, in most cases the followings are included into the conception of modality: *reality, irreality, emotionality, expressiveness, affirmation, negation, doubt, probability, reliability, positiveness, truthfulness, possibility, necessity, obligation, intention, wish, danger, indirectness, information, influence, unconditionality, cause-result, aim, comparison-appreciation* etc. These meanings are mechanically determined by the subjective categories. The above enumerated modal meanings sometimes cross, sometimes exclude each-other, hence the classification of the principles of conception, meaning is violated. Even some of the above-mentioned meanings are not considered as modal meanings, in other words, they are not classified according to modality. But many of the investigators accept the existence of two groups of modality:

- possibility, reality and necessity;
- doubt, problematicness (superiority, probability) and resoluteness.

As it is evident two view points in the explanation of the essence of the modal judgement, which is considered as the form of thinking in the formal logics, are basically taken as the main principles. According to the first one logical judgements are classified as possibility, reality and necessity. It is considered that between the thing about which a judgement is made and its features there can be possibility,

reality or obligation attitudes. According to the second view-point the judgements on the things and the events are divided into true and probable conceptions.

Based upon the above-mentioned theseses we can come to the conclusion that modality is a language category reflecting objective connections (objective modality) and the connections described by the point of view of the speaker (subjective connections) showing itself in the content of the sentence. Objective reality is determined by the subject of the thought with the characterization of its attitudes features, by the objective connections having found their reflections in the sentence, by the reflection of possible ties.

The meanings denoting this or that grade of reality of the content of the sentence denote the meanings of the subjective modality.

Objective and subjective meanings are of different types but they are not contradictory to each-other according to the content, they express. Their total volume compose the components of specificity of their contents.

Let's consider the types of objective and subjective modality. Deferring from the meanings or reality the meanings of possibility and necessity of the category of modality are not gogenous. Two of their meanings are expecially different:

1) Alertic (ontological) possibility and necessity meanings. In these meanings the real condition of the nature and the society, also the phsycological state of the person is looked upon as something important,

2) Deontic (normative) possibility and necessity meanings. But in these meanings the normatives of society including the moral features and borms of behaviour adopted for a certain collective, techinal, local etc. meanings are taken as something imporatnt and these meanings are characterised according to these norms.

Sie Können diesen Brief morgen schreiben. Alle Kinder in der SU solen die Schule besuchen.

Sometimes in the same sentence both alertic and deontic modality fids its reflection:

Ich Kann es tun, aber ich darf es nicht (d.h. ich bin imstange, es zu tun, aber ich habe keine Erbanbus, es zu ten). In this sentence alertic and deontic possibilities are given in the negative forms).

Reality is a notion characterizing the confirmity degree of the judgement (sentence) from the point of view of the subject of thought (speaker, thinker, writer).

As it is known the process of thinking is being realized through many systematic stages. In each of these stages our knowledge on the objective reality becomes richer and richer. At the starting stage the object is so little learned about that it is being given only a thought of problematic character. In this stage the information given about the object is characterized by the varied-graded problematic reality. The information, given finally after the object completely is learned, can be considered as real.

These stages of thinking naturally find their reflection in the language. In different stages the reflection of reality become in different degrees. Hence, reality is realized sometimes in a weaker form and sometimes in a stronger form in the frame of sentences. This strong and weak reflection is being made by modal words and modal means. The reflection of the reality in a sentence construction appears in different degrees. Mainly three degrees are indicated: simple, problematic and resolute. In some languages between the problematic and resolute realities it is mentioned on the existence in many cases intermediate degrees. But mere reality from this point of view is an exclusion. Supposing that there is a great shade of meaning of suspicion in the oposite pole in the problematic reality, where as in the oposite pole in the imperative future there exists little shade of meaning of suspecion, in this case the modal set of reality seems to have been expanded a lot. In this scale the reality seems to have been directed by the line of lessening of the confidence and suspecion of the speaker to its reality.

In the languages of different systems the problematic and resolute modality is formed by the analytical way by the help of proper auxiliary words (particles) expressing the modal meanings, and by the help of analytical verb constructions reflecting the problematic reality. In the flexive languages having the synthesism of different degrees (Russian, German, English, French etc. languages) this is considered as the only means.

Modal words can be characterized as auxiliary words indicating in what degree the content of the sentence is real for the speaker. In other words, modal words

indicate the degree of real reflection of the objective ties within the content of the sentence.

In most of the languages of the world two semantic degrees (class or group) are indicated: 1) Modal words denoting the problematic reality; 2) Modal words expressing utter (resolute) reality. Within any degree it is possible to divide them into special semi-groups making the degree of the content of the sentence detailed.

In the German language the modal words expressing great suspicion, maximal unbelief are the followings: Kaum, schwerlich, unsicher, ungewib, zweifelhaft, fraglich, wenig, warscheinlich.

And the modal word combinations denoting great suspicion and unbelief are the followings: sehr unsicher, sehr ungmib, stark bezweifelt.

The modal words denoting resolute reality and resolute belief to the information of the speaker being the modal words of the same type, very often establish synonymic lines. According to the degree of resoluteness, belief and reality the modal words of this type can be divided into three semantic groups. The words and word-combinations establishing the first group denotes the action of which the speaker was not completely coifident before or the speaker was doubted in any uttered thought before stating the affirmation of the uttered thought, about which the speaker is absolutely confident at present.

The words included into the second group are the modal words which compeletely and resolutely affirm the thought of the speaker. The affirmed thought can be accepted as the one expressing doubtless, obvious, lawful, logical consequence of the natural process.

The third group of words are the modal words and modal word combinations expressing utter belief and confidence of the speaker to the given thought.

In German, English and French and in a number of other languages the equivalets of modal words expressing problematic reality are analytic modal constructions and auxiliary verb combinations. The German *können*, *mögen*, *dürfen*, *sollen*, *woller* type infinitive combinations can be shown as an example to the above mentioned thesis.

The modal combinations expressed in the colloquial speech often are used as synonyms.

In the polysynthetic and synthetic agglutinative type sentences (Japanese, Turkish etc.) languages the problematic and imperative future meanings are formed by synthetic and morphological means. As it is known in Turkish languages including the Azerbaijan language modality is formed by the moods and by the morphological ways. Modal words having simple reality meanings in all the languages are formed by the synthetic means by the indicative mood. All the forms of indicative mood its all paradigms express simple reality.

The grammatical subject (the subject of the sentence) speaking about the reality of the event expressed by the indicative mood or speaking about the event to be taken place in future and the real liun between the verb-predicate is affirmed. The sentences in which verbal predicate is absent the reality is realized by the fact of absence of negative morphological indications.

In all the languages of the world the indicative mood expresses the reality which is one of the forms of objective reality.

In Russian and English languages the oblique mood also serves to express objective modality. But, the oblique Mood does not express problematic meaning, probability, uncertainty etc. The oblique mood of the verb idicates such a link between the subject (the subject of the sentence) and the verbal predicate that in a certain condition this tie can be realized, but it has not yet obtained the chance of realization. In other words, the oblique mood can be understood as the unrealized opportunity. By the oblique mood can also be expressed other non-modal meanings indicating request, wish and advice.

But the other types of the objective modality, for instance possibility, necessity can be expressed by lexical means, synthetic and analytical forms.

In German, English, Russiam and in other flective Into-European languages the alertic and deontik possibilities and necessities are created together with the usage of infinitive combinations of some modal verbs. The lexical meanings of these expressions are determined by the types of the modal meanings.

For example, in the German language modal verbs such as *sollen* and *können* joined with the infinitive of the verbs *lernen* express according deontic necessity and alertic possibility.

Already here modal verbs act not as auxiliary verbs, having purely grammatic function, while stating problematic reality, but as a part of speech forming one of the components in the composition of the sentence.

In German the forms expressing moral, ethics and civil norms are formed by the infinitive of the verb *sollen*. But the combinations expressing the deontic necessity shades of meanings, such as order, reccomendations, advice etc. are formed by the combinations with the verbs *sein*, *sollen*, *brauchen*.

But the physical and psychological state of the subject or alertic possibility associated with the natural events are formed with the infinitives of the verbs *können*, *vermögen*, *haben*, *sein*, *lassen*, *sich*.

The investigations show that it is possible to carry out the formal-grammatic classification only on the subjective modality of the sentence. According to the attitude of the speaker the discrimination of the reality degree of the content of the sentence, is at the same time the descrimination of the form and content of the sentence. This regulation has been once more affirmed in the process of carried out analysis on the materials of the roman-german languages.

Modern syntax theory considers that one of the main features of the sentence is its modality. But the explanation of modality within this frame work is not mono-meaningful. The category of modality forms up some difficulties for translation. It is not occasional that Retsker consider modality as the most difficult lexic grammatic category for translation matters. It is more observed incorrect problems associated with the translation of the modal words or the ways of expression of the category of modality. The non adequet translation of the modal meanings are widely observed in the dictionaries, in the translation of fiction and scientific literature, in the materials dedicated to the translation matters, and in grammar books. In most cases mistakes are made on the reason of mixing up the subjective modality with objective modality, and on not correctly explanation of their meanings. When we speak about modality we mean the reflection of objective connections in the content of sentence (objective

modality) and the appreciation of the meaning of the same sentence from the point of view of the speaker (subjective modality). The objective modality itself is not homogenous. Thus, in the frame of its possibility is being discriminated: *O, masalani hall eda bilar* (He can solve the problem). *O, masalani hall enti* (He solved the problem). *O, macalani hall eda bilacak* (He will be able to solve the problem).

A number of types indicating the degree of reality in the subjective modality are discriminated. In the languages having different systems as minimum three degrees of reality is discriminated: problematic, simple and categorial. For example, *O masalani hall etdi* (He solved the problem). *O, masalani gorunur hall etdi* (He seems to have solved the problem). *O, albatta masalani hall etdi* (of course, he solved the problem). Different from the simple reality the problematic and categorial realities have several degrees in many languages: in these degrees the problematic and categorial affirmation of the reality is explained by the position of the speaker: 1) less probable: to be little supposed, very suspicious (doubtful); causing great doubt; having little probability or doubt, probably or it may be, very probably or very supposedly; 2) naturally or of course, before everything or of course.

In the sentences constructed by this order the certainly to the happened event or problematic character are expressed by the speaker. For example: in the following sentences the problematic character presents itself: *O, guman ki, macalani hall etmishdir* (He must have solved the problem). In the other sentence the certainty of the speaker to the happening is observed: *O chox guman ki, masalani hall etmishdir* (very likely, he has solved the problem).

In order to express the problematic character and resoluteness modal words are used. In this respect two groups are indicated:

1) problematic character reality type modal words: *guman ki, ehtimal ki, aydindir ki, ola bilsin ki, balka* (in Azerbaijan Language); *perhaps, possibly* (in English), *vielleicht, fraglich, wohl, offenbar, möglich* (in German) etc.

2) categorial reality type modal words: *albatta, shubhasiz, sozsuz* (in Azerbaijan Language); *certainly, surely, of course, no doubt, really, indeed* (in English); *gewiss, natürlich, sicher, fraglos* (in German).

The modal meaning of the simple modality is expressed by the indicative mood of the verbs. The other types of objective modality such as possibility, necessity meanings are expressed by the infinitive of the notional verb and by the proper combinations of the modal verbs. Different from the objective modality the subjective modality is not the reflection of the reality, it shows the adequacy of its reflection. Objective and Subjective modalities are not contradictory to each other according to their contents and they are being realized properly by the syntactic and lexic-grammatical levels. There are not serious borders either among the meanings they carry out. Both modal meanings can be formed the same means. Let's pay attention to the following words: *O, masalani hall eda bilar* (*He can solve this problem*). This sentence can be understood in two meanings: 1) *He is able to solve this problem*. 2) *He may solve this problem*.

In the first case the word *bilar* (*is able to*) indicates the meaning of possibility of the objective modality, but in the second case it expresses the meaning of the problematic character of the subjective modality. The verbs in German such as *dürfen*, *können*, *sollen* and *müssen* also carry out the analogical functions. In fact these modal verbs used in "necessity" and "possibility" meanings of the objective modality and in the subjective modality functions indicate the degree of the problematic character of the reality.

In the process of translation when the modal features of the sentence are not correctly understood the translated specimens are not correct and this brings to the distortion of the meaning or attaining incorrect results. Thus in many cases in the process of translation simple, meanings, meanings of problematic character and categorial modal meaning are mixed up by mistake. For example, the German sentence "*Sir wird glücklich geivesen sein*" is translated as "*He, I am sure that is happy*". But in fact the translation of this sentence must be "*He had to be happy and he was happy*".

One of the important problems in German study is all-round analysis of the semantic nature of the modal particles. In order to give the complete analysis of the semantic nature of the German particles, it is necessary to investigate their grammatical essence. In the German language the modal particles, having joined the

predicate of the sentence enter the structure of it, and create new constructions, express by the predicate modal meanings of the subjective modality. Hence, modal particles turn to an important structural element of the predicate, and so carry out as a leading component of the sentence the syntactic function of the sentence having subjective modal meaning. In this way modal particle turns a part of the grammatical form.

What does a subjective modal meaning of the sentence, having modal particle consist of. As it is known there are two types of modality: objective and subjective modalities. Emotional appreciation meaning is also included into the subjective modality.

The difference between these two types of modality lies in the fact of showing the communicative meanings in them in different degrees. Objective modality in the given situation indicates the existing relations. Subjective modality reflects the reality degree of the uttered thought, the level of appreciation of the given thought by the speaker. Together with the emotional appreciation meaning subjective modality in comparison, with the objective modality is the second (Krivonosov, 1982, p.p. 50-58).

As it is known it is very difficult to determine the structure of the objective meaning of this or that grammatical form. As the types of emotion are not divided into structural semantic units, it is more difficult to determine their meanings. For example, the feelings of anger, dissatisfaction, joy, terror do not arise always by the same reason, the reason conditioning them are also expressed by different means in different situations. It's naturally that their appearance in the act of speech are different. In spite of all these above-mentioned difficulties it is possible to investigate the syntactic meaning of the difficult to observe subjective modality. At this time we may ground on the lexic-grammatical parameters of the sentence. Lexic-grammatical parameters limit the subjective interpretations. During the investigations it is necessary not to pay attention to the separately expressed sentence, but to its communicative type, the lexic-grammatical characterizations, to the syntactic relations in the sentences preceding or following that member of the sentence. The relations between the neighbouring sentences can be as to the structure and as to the lexical

completion. Subjective modal sentences very often can be created without the starting retort. The meanings of such sentences become known in the situation. Situation itself determines the structure and the lexical composition. The sentences of this type can be divided into 3 kinds: 1) affirmative; 2) imperative; 3) interrogative.

The subjective-modal meaning type in the frame of affirmative form of the objective modal sentence depends on the structure of the sentence and from the semantics of the verbal predicate. In the German Language *sein* + predicative in the predicates expressed by the *haben* verbs the confidence of the speaker to the happening of the real events as well as different emotions as (anger, excitement, disagreement, sorrow etc.) expressed.

In the sentences consisting of the modal verbal predicates the speaker expresses certainly, possibility (können), wish (wollen), necessity (sollen, müssen), permission (dürfen, mögen, lassen). In these sentences predicate is expressed by the infinitive. In the indicated types of the sentences the meaning of wish is felt. In the sentences formed by the appreciation and by the verbs expressing senses (Glauben, Wissen, Kennen, Denken, Ahnen, Sehen, Hören) the speaker states certainly to the reality of the action expressed by the predicate.

In the imperative mood having objective modal sentences as to the event to be happened or not to be happened the meanings of requirement, request, order, warning, pleading, summons etc. are felt. In the Russian Language in the sentences of this type the particles as *да, ну, а ну, только, уже, все-таки* etc. are used.

Interrogative sentences are rich with interrogative particles too. Their subjective-modal meanings mainly are determined by the following indications:

- a) by the type of interrogative sentences (special and general questions);
- b) by the semantics of the verbal predicate.

In the special interrogative sentences in many cases the predicate is formed with the verb causing the emotional reactions, with the verbs causing subjective values such as *machen, tun, haben, sein* and also by the modal verbs.

In Russian the special questions are formed by *да, же, кто*. In the speech of the author the directions of the emotions of the speaker is indicated. As the total quantity of the actions forming emotional reaction are limited in such interrogative sentences

the number of the verbs acting in the function of predicate are also few. Because, such events must be acceptable by the seeing, hearing and by other organs of senses.

Special question sentences indicating the attitude of the speaker to the previous unreported speech, or to the action of the person the speaker is speaking to, or to the occurred event is just the same with the structure and lexical completeness:

a) Predicate is always in the present tense, because the speaker expresses the emotions, which he/she sees, hears or expresses the emotions that he/she has felt;

b) The predicate is expressed by the verbs expressing the emotional reaction of the speaker or expressed by the actions denoting most common, undiscriminated actions or events or expressed with the modal verbs such as (*haben, sein, tun, marchen*);

c) Sentences must not be compound sentences, complicated by the homogenous sentences;

d) The secondary members of sentence are expressed by adverbs, adverbial-particles, adverbial-nouns, noun-preposition combinations.

By this principle many sentence types are being created by modal particles. These subjective – modal meanings form the sentence types which are unseparable from their syntactic structures and lexical completeness. In the speech in the form of dialogue in comparison with other type of texts, the mutual relations between grammar and lexis is more felt: certain grammar forms only exist with certain lexic units.

In the German language, in the interrogative sentences the following verbs act in the function of predicate: 1) subjective appreciation (*glauben, meinen* etc.); 2) feeling, imagination (*sehen, hören, merken* etc.); 3. modal verbs; 4) other verbs.

The verbs of subjective appreciation such as (*glauben, denken, meinen*) only acts in the principle clauses in the function of predicate.

In the general questions the verbs expressing sensual imaginations such as (*sehen, hören, merken*) as a rule are used with the negative particles such as *nicht, nichts, kein* and mostly are used in simple sentences.

On the background of the general questions in most cases stand rhetoric questions. In these questions the meanings expressing the subjective modal meanings expressing

the hesitation, anger, dissatisfaction, uncapability of the speaker are expressed. Ritoric questions express the information's in three directions: 1) rational question (a type of question asked to get this or that information); 2) subjective modal meanings (doubt, anger, dissatisfaction etc.); 3) logical judgments associated on some problems.

The observations carried out on Russian and German linguistics show that the subjective modal meanings observed in the sentences are not given by the particles expressing them. The character of the subjective – modal meanings much depend on the communicative type of the sentence. In the affirmative sentences the meanings of subjective importance express the faith to the reality of the action, and different emotional-assurance of the speaker to the occurrence. In the special questions the subjective modal meanings reflects a whole scale reflecting the real emotional state of the speaker. Mainly these emotional feelings are the feelings of anger, astonishment, disagreement etc. In the sentences in which modal particles are present the intellectual, volutative and emotional feelings exist in complicated mutual relations and in the process of mixture. As a result of this, the words within the sentences lose their meanings in the other contexts and acquire the volutative-emotional content. Sometimes the sentences constructed by the presence of different subjective modal particles are used in the same meanings, but those being constructed by the same subjective-modal particles express different meanings. Here we may come to the conclusion that, the subjective modal meaning within the sentence is not achieved by the modal particles, mainly it is being attained by the structural-semantic type of the sentence. But the modal particles sometimes can be substituted by the proper synonym. Separately taken modal particles are realized by the semantic shades of meanings in concrete situations. The exact subjective modal meanings can be explained by the result of exact statistic – psycholinguistic analysis.

Subjective-modal sentences exist in real situations in the colloquial speech and at this time, the contexts play great roles. In the text the sentence coming before becomes with the formal and semantic relations with the following sentence. The previous sentence on a certain degree plays the role of preparation of meaning the following sentence. The first sentence acting as a retort creates the regime of dialogue

by the reply retort. Thus, in German, Russian and in other languages it is possible to discriminate for types of the communicative sentences: affirmative, imperative, sentences, special questions and general questions. In the dialogue – retorted rejimes their 16 types can be determined: - affirmative – affirmative, - affirmative – imperative, - affirmative – special questions, imperative – general questions etc.

In the reply retort in each of these models depending on the communicative type, structure, the type of modal particles and lexical completion can express different modal meanings. Between the reply and the retort there are not only semantic but also formal relations. These relations are created on different lexis – grammatic and semantic background.

In the sentences having dialogue – retort structures logical syllogisms are used in order to draw out logical consequences. In the type of sentences giving such structures several sentences of retorted character are used. The problem of the semantic nature of the modal particles are very complicated and many-sided. That's why first of all it is necessary to determine the logical border-line of modal particles with the logical modality. It is also very important to determine the crossing-points of the modal particles with the logical modality and the differences between them. The comparison of modal particles with other word groups, investigation of word-groups used only in the modal meanings give the possibility to characterize the modality as a universal category.

In German study the investigation of modality is still a large field a text than the sentence level makes it possible to determine the functional semantic field of modality and the essence of this aspect.

Modality can also be investigated in the frame of the functional-semantic field theory. As it is known. The round of semantic field according to the semantic volume is separated into macro and micro fields. For the correct explanation of modality, the importance investigation of micro fields are huge. As it is known the subjective modality has the types denoting reality / lie and intention. In all the sentences there is modality giving either one of the meanings of truth or lie. That's why this question is more investigated. The reality or unreality of the attitude of the speaker or the writer is being determined by the subjective thought. The attitude of the speaker or the

writer to the reality of to the unreality can be expressed by the following semantic fields.

1. Adequacy to the objective reality;
2. Reality can be proved;
3. Giving the name of the speaker / writer;
4. Giving the name of the speaker;
5. Reality can't be proved (can hardly be proved). (See Zommerfield, 1988, p.p. 10-15). In this case the verb/noun having modal component reflects the point of view of the speaker and is expressed by the indicative mood of the verb.
6. The guarantee of the reality of the utterance. Verb/noun word combination having modal semantics used in the indicative mood guarantees the reality of the utterance.
7. The probable adequacy of the objective reality. In this case the speaker/writer may or may not be indicated. In this case the attitude of the speaker is expressed by predicative clause composed of verb/noun + modal component.
8. The probable non-adequacy of the reality. The speaker/writer may be lied or not hed. The probable non adequacy is in the form of subordinate clause and in the future tense form expressed by the verb/noun construction having modal components. In this sentence lexical means (modal particles) are used.
9. The non-possibility of the objective reality. The speaker/writer can be or can't be named. The verb/noun having modal component is used in the indicative mood. In this sentence negative means are also widely used.

The texts according to the degree of argumentation of the modality category texts are divided into the following types. In these investigated texts which of the functional semantic fields (reality, unreality) that are more used can be found out. By this a relation between the functional semantic and functional-communicative description is being created. Argumentization being an independent process is different and has different types. Its content consists of speech forms having a number of compositions. In these speech forms the subjective attitude of the speaker/writer finds its reflection to this or that event.

K.E.Zommerfeldt indicates four types of argumentations in the texts of different types: (Zommerfeldt. P.p.10-15)

1. The explanatory argumentation to be taken in progress (das entwickelnderklarende Argumentieren). Its function consists of gaining experiences by the result of observations, learning the relations between the things and the events and in this way to investigate to action. Such an argumentation in the social practice does not justify itself. In this case collectives or this or that person are mobilized for the execution of a complicated task.

2. Argumentations of explanatory-discussion character (das erklärebdauseinandersetzen de Argumentieren). Here the main attention is given to the refutation of untrue thoughts and the proof and substantiation of the true decisions. This form is mainly used most of all for the condemnation of the old thoughts, unthought evil deeds and for the purpose of indication of the constructive ways. This includes the themes acquiring social importance, labour discipline and obedience to the education program, defense of environment, sound upbringing etc.

3. Discussion – explanatory (polemic) argumentation. In this process the necessity and truthfulness of this or that point of view is proved, the draw-backs of the other view points their being harmful explained with facts.

As a rule in the explanatory argumentations which is taken in progress the argumentation begins with the information of the listener/reader. This stage is considered as the starting stage. Then begins the stage of exact, all-round expression, explanation and the formulization of the result of the problem.

For example, supposing that in a certain flat fire took place. First of all after event position of the disaster is being described. The territory that the fire has covered in the flat, the burnt objects, whether the owners of the house have got damages or not, the term of the liquidation of fire etc. Then the causes of fire (uncarelessness, technical unfitness in the electric or gas line etc.) is indicated. In the final stage the results of the event is analysed, advice of consultative character is given (to be careful, the exact checking up of the electric on gas line, liquidation of the technical unfitness etc.).

Different from above-mentioned in the specific argumentation of explanatory discussion of explanatory discussion the thoughts contradicting each other are being explained and discussed. After all these thoughts are explained the decision made by the author is offered.

In the above-indicated situation associated with the fire the analysis of different from each-other thoughts, counter arguments are required. Here the personal ideas of the person talking about the event is accepted. The author acts as the support of the people having witnessed the event, the theseses that the majority have accepted and of those many of which consider one version as a true one.

As the consequence it may be indicated that in the stage of argumentation reality/falsehood in the modal field the language means are used as the followings:

- In all the variants of argumentations reality plays a great role in the language means of the falsehood field;

- In the explanatory argumentations taken in progress the author is sure to have expressed his personal opinion. In this process language means belonging to “certainty” and “uncertainty” microfields are used;

- In the polemic variants of argumentation contradictory, harmful view-points are discussed and appreciated. At this moment the personal opinion of the author is substantiated. Here the usage from all microfields are envisaged.

The German language which is taught as a foreign language the above-mentioned methods are used in two directions.

If the argumentation acts the language means of reality/unreality macrofield is widely taught:

- It is foreseen that this or that element of the microfield has got different degrees of use age in the argumentation, in different types of texts.

2.3. The investigation of the category of modality in Turkology.

In the part of general notes of the first chapter the information about the main directions of the investigations associated with the category of modality in turkology was presented. It is worth-mentioning that in the turkological literature the linguists such as A.N.Kononov, N.A.Baskakov, K.V.Musayev, F.R.Zeynalov, Z.Alizadeh,

M.Husseyinzadeh, A.Aslanov, M.Rahimov, A.Djavadov, N.Direnkova and others have great services (See: Kononov (1956, 1960; Baskakov 1951, 1960; Musayev 1964; Zeynalov 1965; Alizadeh 1963, 1965; Husseyinzadeh 1973; Aslanov 1960, 1967; Rahimov 1966; Djavadov 1959, 1980; Direnkova 1941).

A.N.Kononov includes the modal words into the group of auxiliary words and offers to unite them under the term “particles” (Kononov, 1956, p.p. 345-346). Particles in their turk are divided into the pine particles and name-particles. As to the author, the pure particles are not stable sound groups, having no other meaning than grammatical semantics they often have the specific features of suffixes. On the other hand, as the particles carry-out semantic purposes, they bear the functions close to conjunctions.

Though the modal words from the functional point of view have adequet meanings with the particles mainly they express the attitude of the speaker to the occurance. As to the author particles and modal words are closely associated with different parts of speech. To such parts of speech conjunctions, adverbs and pronouns can be set as examples.

A.N.Kononov divides the modal words used in modern Turkish languages into three groups:

Those expressing different shades of meanings in the process of speech: *ishta* – *in fact*. In the folk colloquial speech this modal word has the variants of *na*, *nah*. Sometimes these variants are met used together: *nah, ishta bak!* – *such is the thing*.

In the Turkish languages the modal word *de* is used in the meaning of indication. In Turkish the modal word *hatta* – even has a wide scope of usage. It is necessary to mention that the words which A.N.Kononov has referred to the group of modal words, they are particles in Azerbaijanian language.

Onu gordum, hatta konushtum da (*I saw him and even had a talk with him*) (Turkish-Russian dictionary, 1977, p. 392).

The modal word *bila* is unstressed: *Benden bila* (*After this*).

In the Turkish language the particle *ta* in the modal meaning is used to specify the occurance of the event. It is also used to express still more exactness to time:

- *ta akshama gadar, ta bashtan* (*till evening, from the very beginning*);

- *ta sabaha kadar bekledim* (waited till the very morning)
- *dağın ta tepesine kadar* (just till the top of the mountain) (Turkish-Russian dictionary, p.814).

The particle “*ta*” has some other meanings too: *hakikaten ta kandisi* (just the real truth).

A.N.Kononov speaking of the usage of the particles in the modal meanings, sometimes he similarized them. The borders between the modal means and modal words remain uncertain.

Just as a result of this in many Turkish languages the category of modality is not mentioned separately and modal words are related to particles, adjunctions and conjunctions (See: Baskakaov, 1951, 1960; Zeynalov, 1974; Usifov, 2001 etc.).

A.N.Kononov shows that the particle *har* (every) has two meanings: generalizing pronoun and strengthening – generalizing particle.

In the Turkish-Russian dictionary the following meanings of the word *har* has been mentioned: *her, her biri, her desa, her gun, her gunku, her iki taraf, her insan, ferdikcha, her an, her bakimdan, her cheshit, her daim, her gordugun sakallinin bab diye kuchagina varma; her halda, her hali, her hangi, her ishin hakkidan gelmek, her kafadan bir ses chikiyor, her kes, her kim, her kimsa, her kim ise, her nasil, her ne hal, her ne kadar, her ne vakit, her nedense, her neredede, her neyse, her ne ise, her nice, her sheyden evvel (once), her sheyin bir zamani var, her tarafta atesh kesilmek, her tarafta/yerde, her tarafda bezi olmaq, her telden chalmak, her havadan chalmak, her vakit/zaman, her yerde, her yerde ve her buchakta, her zaman, her zamanki gibi, her agac kokunden churur, her agachin meyvasi olmaz, her ari bal vermez, her ashin kashigi, her chichikin bir kokusu var, her chichek koklanmaz, her chok azdan olur, her derde deva, her firavunun bir Musasi chikar, her gun kedi/papaz pilav yemez; her horoz kendi choplugunde oter; her kashigin kismeti bir olmaz, her koyun kendi bacagindan asilir; her kushun eti yenmez, her sheyi bilen bir sheyi bilmez, her sheyin choklugu azindan/her chok azdan olur, her shey incelikten, insan kalinlikten kirilir, her sheyin yenisi, dostun eskisi; her tash-bash yarmaz; her yigidin bir yogurt yiyisi var; her yokushun bir inishi/her inishin bir yokushu var; her ziyan bir oguttur* (Turkish-Russian dictionary, p.401).

Many of the meanings of the word are used in the function of particle. That's why the specification of the word *her* as a modal word might not be correct.

A.N.Kononov considers the expressions *bari*, *hich*, *olmazsa*, *hich degilsa* as synonymic modal words. This idea is also disputable. For example, if in the following sentence the conjunction *ki* (*that*) is considered as a modal word, then modal words become absolutely similar with particles and there is no need to explain them separately: *Onlare oyle gozledim ki, (I waited them so much that...)*.

We think that in this sentence the word *ki* is used in the function of a particle. In the book "*Muasir turk adabi dilinin grammatikasi*" (*The Grammar of Modern Literary Turkish Language*) the introduction of particles together with the modal words is associated with the thesis that the Author has mentioned in advance. But, as it is known. In the Azerbaijan linguistics particles and modal words are investigated differently.

A.N.Kononov systematizes the words giving modal shade of meanings as the followings:

- The words expressing modal-voluntary shades of meanings;
- Modal words expressing attitude to the truth (reality);
- Modal words expressing supposition;
- Modal words used during the comparison of the events having similar or probable character.

Modal words expressing modal-voluntary shades of meanings most of all are used with verbal predicates and give them the imperative shade of meaning.

Modal words of this type are pronounced with a special type of intonation. In the Modern Turkish literary language the modal word *ha* depending upon the intonation are used in three meanings:

- when it is pronounced with exclamatory intonation it creates the meanings of forbiddance, working in the predicate or it strengthens these meanings;
- in the interrogative intonation it is likely to be introduced the meanings of probability, sorrow, astonishment;
- in ordinary, calm intonation of narrative sentences the meaning of the predicate established on the same basis is strengthened.

Analogically the modal words *be* depending on the intonation creates different shades of meanings:

- by the intonation of interjection it creates unconditionally imperative shade of meaning;

- by the interrogative intonation it creates sharp interrogative situation.

To this group of words the followings are included: *haydi/hadi, hele, bakalim, bakayim, gitti* (Kononov, 1956, p.351).

In the Modern Turkish literary language the modal words expressing attitude of the speaker to the objective reality are divided into 3 groups too.

- affirmative modal words (*evet, hay-hay etc.*);

- negative modal words (*hair, yok, yo, degil etc.*);

- interrogative modal words (*mi, interrogative pronouns, intonation*).

As the interrogative modal words *hani, ha, degil, mi, acep, acaba* are more used.

As an affirmative modal word *evet* both to its meaning and syntactic function may substitute any member of interrogative sentence – its predicate, object, adverb etc. The word *evet* at the same time can be used with interrogative sentences, with its separately taken parts or with its synonyms: *Haster misin? Evet, hastayam* (*Are you ill. Yes, I am ill*).

In ordinary situation *evet* is used in the meanings of *bali, ha* (*yes*): *Evet efendim – bali (ha) afandim. Evet makaminda bashine salladi* (Turkish-Russian dictionary, p.283).

The modal word *evet* is sometimes observed in the function of parenthesis too. In the Turkish literary language the word *evet* has several synonyms: *hay/hay, peki/pek iyi, pekala, elbette, elbet, bash usta, tamam, guzel, dogru, olur, muhakkak, tabii, gercek* etc.

Negative modal words *hayir, yok*, including its antonym *evet* are considered as the operative words in the livelt turkish literary language. *Hayir* also is used as the as the interrogative sentence, repetition of its part or as its synonym. This word is also observed as a parenthesis. Sometimes the word *hayir* used together with the word *yok* serves to denote the possession of something by somebody is missing. The word *Hayir* has a very wide scope of meaning as a synonym of the word *yok*.

In the Turkish language the modal words denoting doubt and probability are the followings: *balki, ihtimal ki, galiba* etc.

– *Balki de hic gelmez* (May be he won't come).

– *Ihtimali azder/yoxdur* (There is little probability no probability).

In the Turkish Language the modal words which are used in the process of confrontation, comparison of the words, similar and supposed events can be indicated as the followings: *tipki, sanki, guya*.

These words agree with the adjunctive *gibi*:

– *sanki kabahat benimish* (TRD, p.75);

– *tibki onun kibi soyledi* (TRD, p. 861);

– *guya buraya beni gormek ichin gelmish* (TRD, p.370).

In the Turkish Language a group of form establishing modal words are widely used.

Words of this type express objectively, the possibility or impossibility, necessity or obligation. The followings can be set as example: *mumkun, imkan, olur, mumkun deyil, imkansiz, imkan yok, gorek, olmaz, lazim, luzumsuz, demek* etc. (Kononov, 1956, p.355).

It is necessary to note that in Turkish languages the modal words establishing forms agree with the mood in Azerbaijan. As it is known the mood having the modal character in the Azerbaijan language is the thought accepted by a number of investigators and in this respect a number of investigations have been carried out.

In the Uzbek Linguistics the meanings and functions of modal words in comparison with other languages are merely different. Mainly in all the Turkish Languages modal words have the same grammatic peculiarities. The difference lies in the fact that in some of the Turkish languages the words have not been differentiated as a separately taken part of speech. In the Uzbek language modal words express the attitude of the speaker to the objective reality, to the truthfulness, to the given information, to certain facts.

Modal words derive from different parts of speech. A.N.Kononov divides the modal words into time degrees:

– words expressing different shades of meanings in the process speech;

- words creating different modal shades of meanings;
- words fulfilling the functions of establishing forms (Kononov, 1960, p.336).

In the Uzbek Language the followings creating different shades of meanings can be set as an example:

Mana, ana, xatta, xattaki, xamisha, bari etc.

Man by kitabki yku (Read me this book)

Ana kyrdingu, nima byldi? (See what happened?)

Xatto men xam vulmaii kolibman (Even I didn't know)

Yxamisha ykish bilan band (He is always busy learning his lessons) (Uzbek-Russian Dictionary, p.652).

In the Modern Uzbek Language the words bringing modal shades of meanings are the followings: *-kani; -xa, xa shunday, balli; -uyk; -labboau; -chunonch; -fakat; -naxot; -xolbuki; -shekilli.*

In the Uzbek Language the modal words bearing the form creating functions form the adequate meaning expressed by the indicative mood in the Turkish languages: *kepak, mumkun, mumkun emac, lozik* (See: Bonpensov, 1958; Shoabduramanov, 1953).

It is necessary to note that, in the Turkish languages sometimes modal words are learned in morphology, but sometimes in the branch of syntax. F.Zeynalov in his book “The Comparative Grammar of the Turkish Languages” dealing with different features of the different parts of speech in separately taking Turkish languages writes: “In the Modern Turkish languages the number of parts of speech are very different. Only in the Oghuz group of languages their number is marked from 9 to twelve. Even in the works dedicated to one language this differentiations show itself”.

In the Azerbaijan language the number of parts of speech reach to 12: noun, adjective, numeral, pronoun, adverb, verb, adjunction, conjunction, particle, modal word, interjection and others.

In the Turkman Language the number of parts of speech (soz toparlari) are eleven: at (noun), sipat (adjective), san (say), chalishima (pronoun), ishlik (verb), xal (adverb), umluk (interjection) ses va shakil anladan sozlar (nimemlar), posleloglar (goshmalar), (adjunctions), sayuzlar (conjunctions), ovnuk boleklar (particles).

In the moder gagauz language the following are included into the parts of speech (soz paylari), adlig (isim) (noun), nishannik (adjective), saylik (numeral), aderlik (pronoun), ishlik (verb), ishxallig (adverb) ardlaflar (adjunctions), baalayicilar (conjunctions), payciklar (particles).

In the Modern Turkish Language parts of speech have been mentioned as the followings: ad (noun), sifat (adjective), sayi (numeral), zamir (pronoun), adil (adverb), fiil, eylem (verb), ilgec, edat (adjunction), baglac, rabbit (conjunction), unlem, nida (interjection). "In other Modern Turkish Languages the position is just the same" (Zeynalov, 1974, p.p. 12-13). We may partially agree with this idea of F.Zeynalov. In fact in the normative Grammar of the Turkish Languages in spite of the fact that modality has not been fully considered, but it has found its reflection in separately taken Turkish languages such as Turk, Uzbek, Gagauz, Azerbaijan, Turkmen etc. investigations on the category of modality has been carried out (See: Kononov, 1956, 1960; Husseynzadeh, 1973; Aslanov, 1957; Cavadov, 1959; Zeynalov, 1965; Alizadeh, 1963; Budagova, 1963 etc.).

Dealing with sentences F.Zeynalov has mentioned that to the sentences used in these languages before everything predicativity plays important role (of course, intonation and modality must be taken into consideration). (Zeynalov, 1981, p.54). Later on in the Turkish Languages the category of modality and modal word have been chosen by F.Zeynalov as one of the well rounded object of investigations (See: Zeynalov, 1965).

In the Turkish Languages one of the works dedicated to the investigation of the category of modality is the monography, dedicated to the problem of sentence in the Turkish Languages written by A.N.Baskakov (See: Baskakov A.N., 1984). As it is known, modality being a grammatical category is created by lexic, gramatic means and by intonation and acts as an insaparable part of predicativity in the sentence. A.N.Baskakov takes the modality in the context of the sentence and investigates it according to the syntactic functions.

Modality as a grammatic category are separated into the subjective and objective modality. These two modalities in their turk associate the content of the sentence with the objective reality and the subjective attitude of the speaker.

In the sentence in many cases the objective modality is expressed by the Indicative Mood. For example, the indicative mood in all the tense forms express reality in the modal plan. In the sentences formed by the indicative mood simple actions or situations objectively find their reflections. The other mood forms of the verbs (imperative, suppositional, conditional, oblique moods) together with expressing indefinite tense relations, they also express the following modal relations, such as probability, problematic character, necessity, the completion of the action etc.

In the modern Turkish language modality is expressed by different lexic, morphological, syntactic and also by intonation means. In this type of speech process still more interrogative, affirmative or negative, expressive appreciations, including utterance or weakened subjective attitudes are observed.

In the sentence objective and subjective modality can also agree with each-other. The predicate of the sentence is expressed by this or that form of the verb and is in the content of the objective content. In such situations the subjective attitude to the utterance can have or have not the same meanings with the predicate.

Subjective modality makes its appearance in this or that degree in any sentence and from this point of view becomes one of the important features of the sentence from the point of view of modality. The universal character of such-type sentences lie in the fact that they can agree with all the types of reality on one hand (real, unreal), and on the other hand they can agree with each-other. Taking some exceptions into considerations, it can be indicated that any modal meanings can be in the affirmative or in the negative meaning.

Interrogative modality can be agreed with any other types of modality, including the affirmative or negative modality. A.N.Baskakov mentions that real objective reality reflects the degree of reliability of the attitudes to the reality of the utterance. Real objective realities have no special grammatical features and this function carried out by the features of the indicative mood. In this context modality and tense categories must not be compared with each other. Modality reflex the reality degree of the content of the utterance and is not only expressed by the grammatical means, but also by the lexical means.

But, the category of tense expresses the relative attitude of the action at the process of speech and it finds its reflection by verb forms. It's worth mentioning that the main content of the objective reality is the real degree of reliability of the utterance. In the imperative tense forms the degree of reliability is still higher, but in the indefinite subjective tenses. They are low. The indicative mood of the verbs except expressing this modal shades of meanings express other meanings. In the modern Turkish language “*yor*” indicates the maximum adequacy of the actions happened in the same time.

The suffix “*makta*” forming together with forming the present tense form with the suffix “*yor*” indicate the reality of the action having already taken place or which is in the process.

The “*or*” form of the present tense (present future tense) indicates the probability of the action to be taken place.

The suffixes “*di*” and “*mish*” which form the past indefinite tenses statue the real existence of the action or the supposed action creates contraduction:

Suleymaniye Camii’ni mimar Sinan yaptı (Sulemaniye mosque was build by the architect Sinan).

Suleymaniye Camii’ni mimar Sinan yapmish (Suleymaniye Mosque has been built by the architect Sinan).

In the second sentence the shade of meaning of suspision has been felt: *(They say, Suleymaniye Mosque (more probably) has been built by architect Sinan).*

The suffix “*-ajak*” indicating the future indefinite tense shows suspision, probability to the action to be taken place in future. As to A.N.Baskakov in the tense forms of the indicative mood modality doesn't finds its exact and obvious reflection. In the complicated of the indicative mood by the help of the suffix “*-dir*” modality find its obvious and unanimous reflection. Whether the action is not imperative or its probable is attained by the suffix “*-mish*” but after the suffix “*-mish*”. “*-dir*” can be used with which the taken action seems to have found its affirmative meaning. The objective modality of irreal plans except the indicative mood of the verbs is created by the other forms of verb and is divided into two parts: insisting and conditional moods.

The urgative modality in its term seems to have formed imperative, subjunctive, oblique and sometimes conditional moods. The urgative mood expresses the following meanings:

- 1) order: *Pencereyi aç, oda havalandır* (Open the window and air the room);
- 2) request: *Kahvenizi buyurun* (Pl. have your coffee);
- 3) pleading: Tanrı, sen bizi koru (God save us);
- 4) insistence: *Hele hele, böyle bakalım* (Speak like this we shall see);
- 5) avoidance: *Sakin oraya gitme* (Don't go there by all means).
- 6) wish: *Allah belasını versin* (Let the god wish him) (it is expressed by the imperative mood);
- 7) oblique mood or necessity mood: *A kardeşim bu işi yapmalıydınız* (You, my brother, you ought to do this) (Look, Baskakov, 1984, p.p.15-16).

The conditional modality in the Turkish languages is mostly formed by the modal suffix *-se/-sa* of the conditional mood and indicates unreal (probably) supposed actions. Conditional mood is mainly observed. In subordinate clauses concession and sometimes by the simple sentences contractions.

In the simple sentences the affirmative modality is expressed by the lexical, grammatical and syntactical means, also by intonation. Here the reality is formulated by the subjective opinion of the speaker.

Affirmative modal sentences are divided into 2 parts:

- 1) answer to the question in the affirmative form;
- 2) (modality) affirmation having nothing to do with the answer.

The affirmative sentences consisting of the affirmative answers to the questions are formed by the word combinations and by affirmative words: *evet, gerçekten, şüphesiz, hakikaten, peki, hay-hay, tabii, mutlaka, muhakkak, elbette, behemehal, vallahi, tamamiyla, iyi, tamam, baskın, ne dursun olsun*.

If the sentences in which the main part of the sentences in an answer is expressed by one word or by a word combination turn to ellipses. The affirmative sentences in which the predicate is expressed by the indicative, oblique, suppositional moods by addition to them the suffix *-dir*.

The suffix *-dir* gives the modal sentences the meaning of affirmation and the meaning of certaining to the reality of the action which has happened. The help of the suffix *-dir*. Having the modal meaning is formed in the following cases:

1) *-yor* by adding to the suffixes indicating the forms of present tenses: *istiyor(dir)*;

2) *-ar* after the present future tense forms suffixes: *istiyirim(dir)*;

3) *-mish* after subjective past tense suffixes: *istemish(dir)*;

4) *-acak* after non-imperative future tense forms suffixes: *bakacak(dir)*;

5) *-makta* after present continuous tense form suffixes: *bakmakta(dir)*;

6) *-mali* after the oblique mood: *bakmale(dir)*.

Modality also formed by means of adding suffix: *-dir* to the words indicating names: *-yeshildir*.

In the Modern Turkish Language affirmative modality is also formed by the syntactic means. The sentences indicating such modalities is mostly formed by the negative, interrogative forms of the suffixes indicating present-future (*-ar*) and imperative past tense suffix (*-de*).

Affirmative sentences in the modern Turkish languages sometimes are attained by double negations. Affirmative modality is observed by the usage of the negative words and word combinations such as *yok* or *hayir* at the beginning of the sentences: *Yok, Ali iyi adamdir* (No, Ali is a good man).

In the negative modal sentences according to the idea of the speaker non-real, non-existing situations to the action is expressed.

Negative modal sentences are expressed by grammatical and syntactical means, by the special intonation forms. Intonation here falls upon the word which is made negative.

Negative modality forming lexical means can be divided into two groups: 1) the words independently creating modality; 2) words which can't independently form modality. Such words can form modality only by the help of grammatical means. The first group of words include the following words having negative meanings: *deyil*, *yok*, *ne*, *ne (de)*. The second group of words included the particle *hayir*, the negative

adverb *hich*, *asla* and also the word combinations having negative meanings such as *hichbir*, *hich*, *kimsa*, *hich*, *bir zaman* etc.

The word *degil*, which creates an independent negative modality has the potentials to be used in all tenses and with all types of suffixes. It is necessary to mention that in the Azerbaijanian language the word “*deyil*” has also a wide scope of usage and it can freely accept the tense, person and type suffixes.

The words which can't form modal negative they can't be used in the negative near the predicate. “With the word *Hayir*” the predicate coming after it is not used in affirmative form, but in the negative form and forms the negative modality. It is worth mentioning that the sentences formed by the help of the word “*hayir*” may turn to eleipsis.

In the modern Turkish Languages the negative modality is created by the morphological means. The negative suffix comes before the suffixes of the tense forms of the verbs, suffixes of moods, person, number and also the suffixes of participle and infinitive. The negative modality can be perfect or imperfect. In the perfect negative modality the negative suffix is joined the end of the root of the notional verb to be used as in the function of predicate.

Elbisemi, giyemege bile vakit bulamadim in imperfect negative modality the part of the sentence homogenous predicate is in affirmative, while the other part is in negative form:

Eshegin sozune inanmiyorsun, benim sozume inanmiyorsun. Imperfect negative modality, is also observed in the affirmative form of the modal predicate, the non-finite of the verb participle and infinitive.

In the Turkish Language the indication of the negative modality is in most cases as just the same as in other Turkish Languages *-ma/-me-dir*.

Negative modality can also be used by the syntactic means. In this case the negative modality more often is used by the rhetoric questions. In the interrogative modality in the attitude of the speaker to the utterance exist loss of confidence, doubt, but confidence to the uttered opposite thought.

Interrogative modality is formed by means of lexic units acting in the function of interrogative words: *kim geldi?* (*who came?*). As the full member sentences they

can substitute all the other members of the sentences, except the predicate. Like the subject of the Interrogative sentences *kim? na?* (*who, what*) are used: *kim geldi* (*who came*). The indicated interrogative pronouns can also receive plural forming suffixes: *kimler geldiler?*

The interrogative *kach?* and *hangi* by receiving possessive suffixes can be used as the subject of the interrogative sentences.

The interrogative pronouns, such as *kim?*, *na?* receiving the case suffixes can be used in the function of object: *kimi?*, *nayi?*, *kimdan?*, *neden?*, *kime?*, *neye?*. In the function of object the interrogative pronouns can also be used: *kimi* (*neyi*) *bekliyordunuz?*

The interrogative pronouns acting in the function of adverb and forming negative modality are divided into several groups:

a) Lexical combinations formed on the basis of *Ne! nasıl?* (*ne asıl?*), *nechin* (*ne ichin?*)

b) The case forms of the interrogative pronoun *Ne?* is used with words belonging to the main parts of speech and adjunctive combinations: - *ne zaman?*, *ne vaxt?* *ne surette?*

The interrogative pronouns can also be used in the function of: *hangi?*, *nasil?*, *ne kibi?*

Some modal words expressing doubt, suspicion, astonishment can take part in formation of interrogative modality: *belki*, *ha*, *hani*, etc. (see: Baskakkov, 1984, p.p. 26-27).

In the formation of interrogative modality a number of lexic-syntactic means play active role. For ex.: in the Turkish Language particle *me*, used at the side of any member of the sentence can create interrogative modality. The indicated particle used after the forms of participle and after the classified forms of the verbs can after word adjoin itself complex time suffixes, also person and number suffixes: *Geliyor musunuz?*

Sometimes interrogative particle comes after the complete forms of the verbs: *Geliyormusunuz mu?* In this case question refers to the event that has happened.

The aim of these interrogative words is to specify the happening event. That's why the questions of these types are called repeated questions.

In the Turkish language in the formation of interrogative modality the participation of the following lexical units are observed: – *aceba, sanki, yani, ya (mi), degil (mi)* etc.

The indicated lexical units seem to have created the various forms of negative modality in different lexical-syntactical constructions. It is necessary to mention that A.A.Baskakov in his monographic investigation has shown that the modality discovered on the materials of the Turkish Languages can be referred to a number of Turkish Languages (See: Baskakov, 1984, p.p.12-29).

One of the most prominent investigations dedicated to the category of modality in the Turkish Language is “Модальность как лингвистическая категория» (Modality as one of the linguistic categories) worked out by F.A.Aghayeva (Aghayeva, 1990). In this monographic works modality has been investigated on the linguistic materials of the Turkman and English Languages. It's necessary to mention that the author in her works has discovered the linguistic essence of the category of modality, has analysed its crosslineness with logics and philosophy. In the works the link of predictability, and the mood with modality has been looked through, its semantic diapazone has been determined. On the background of the two different from each-other languages Turkman and English Languages the ways of expressing modality have been investigated.

F.Aghayeva mainly has specified modality as a linguistic category, has made attempts to show its structural and semantic features.

Theoretically the relativity of the predicativity of the modality and the mood, modality and the problem of sentence, real and unreal modality, its semantic diapazone, the ways of expression of the modality in the sentence, its general features and some other issues have been analyzed a number of original results have been attained. In the further parts of the monography the ways of expression of modality in the English and Turkman Languages are investigated. First of all the morphological ways of expressing modality in both languages are learned, in the Turkman language the links between the mood and category of number with modality is being

determined. The author considers that to think that the indicative mood in comparison with modality which is sometimes assumed as neutrality is impossible. In fact in the indicative mood the subjective attitude to the reality finds its reflection.

In the introduction of F.Aghayeva the indicative mood is considered as one of the main means of the creation of modality in the Turkmen and English Languages. The author having made statistic calculations has come to a conclusion that, among the chosen 10 thousand specimens the investigating modality has been mainly used by the imperative verb forms. In the English language 82%, in Turkman more that 93% have been in the function indicated by the imperative mood (Aghayeva, 1990, p.73).

As a result of investigations the author has come to the conclusion that in the Turkman and English languages the imperative mood has different features. In English, imperative consisting of verb forms belong to the II person singular and plural. But in the Turkman language imperative is observed in several forms:

- 1) II person singular – verb root, verb root + - sana/sana suffixes, verb root + - gin (-gin, -gun) –gun, verb root + - i/i, u/u;
- 2) II person plural – verb root + person suffix (-in, -in, -un, -un);
- 3) III person singular – verb root + sin/sin, -sun/-sun;
- 4) III person plural – verb root + sinlar/sinlar, sunlar/sunlar (Aghayeva, 1990, p. 107).

The most attention drawing part of the works is the lexical ways of expression of modality in the English and Turkmen Languages.

Modality in both languages more than often is expressed by the modal words. The majority of investigators refir the modal words to the auxiliary parts of speech in the Turkmen language and call them “*evnuk sozlar*” (word by word translation is little words). But a group of investigators consider them as independent parts of speech) (Aghayeva, 1990, p.118).

F.Aghaeva divides the modal words in English and Turkman Languages into three main groups:

- 1) Modal words and modal expressions expressing certainty;
- 2) Modal words and modal expressions expressing doubt, uncertainty;

3) Modal words and word combinations indicating the utterance of the speaker as desirable or undesirable (Aghayeva, 1990, p.138).

In the monograph the functions of the modal words establishing the line of modal words denoting the meanings of knowledge and thinking have been investigated. In the further chapters the lexic syntactic ways of modality are compared and the results acquiring theoretical scientific importance have been attained. Then role of intonation, prosodic means etc. in forming modality have been reflected.

2.4. The investigation of the category of modality in the Azerbaijan linguistics.

In the Turkological literature in the book “The Grammar of Modern Turkish and Uzbek Languages” A.N.Kononov for the first time began to investigate modality as a separate category (See: Kononov, 1956; 1960). Since that time, the category of modality, modal words, the ways of expression of the modality in the languages having different systems began to be investigated in the Azerbaijan linguistics too.

In number of articles, dissertations, text books and monographs the linguistic essence of modality is revealed, its morphological, syntactic – semantic means of expressions are analyzed. The Azerbaijanian linguists A.A.Aslanov, A.M.Javadov, F.R.Zeynalov, N.A.Aghazadeh, J.Jafarov, M.Husseyinzadeh, Z.Alizadeh, M.Rahimov, Z.I.Zeynalov and others have rendered great services in the investigation of modality as a linguistic category and in its explanation (See: Aslanov, 1957, 1960; Javadov, 1959, 1980; Zeynalov, 1965, 1971, 1974, 1981; Aghazadeh, 1965, 1966; Javadov, 1963; Husseyinzadeh, 1973; Alizadeh, 1963, 1965; Rahimov, 1966; Budagova, 1963).

First of all linguists A.A.Aslanov investigated the category of modality, especially the modal words among Azerbaijan linguists (Aslanov, 1957, 1960). He considers modality as philosophical-logical, at the same time grammatic category. As to the author philosophical modality is general, but logical modality is concrete and unanimous. Here judgement is either affirmed or denied. But the grammatic modality in this respect is wider and many-sided. Different from the logican and philosophical modality here the reality truthfulness, exactness of the judgement is expressed by the

attitude of the speaker to the reality. Sometimes the information happening around us is completely resolutely affirmed or in some cases it is thought to be as something doubtful or imaginary. Any information in the objective or subjective plan either finds its real or unreal reflection. So, in the Azerbaijan linguistics for the first time A.A.Aslanov has made attempts to separate philosophical, logical and linguistic modality from one another, carries out vast analysis to reveal its linguistic essence (Aslanov, 1957).

It is worth mentioning that in the center of A.A.Aslanov's investigations stands modal words. The author takes modal words as the ways of expression of modality in the Azerbaijan Language, investigates their lexical, morphological, syntactical functions, makes attempts to determine their roles and places in the word stock. Particles, conjunctions and adjuncts being different from the auxiliary parts of speech, the modal words have specific features of their own. From this point of view they shouldn't be mixed up with other parts of speech. Modal words serve to state the reality of the utterance, the affirmation or negation of its certainty, probability, uncertainty in the form of negation or affirmation, or it indicates the continuation, explanation, general results of the refused or affirmed thoughts (Aslanov, 1957, p.p.173-75).

The author takes as the modal words or modal expressions the followings: *albatta* (of course), *zannimizca* (we think), *hagigatan* (really), *shubhasiz* (certainly), *yagin* (surely), *balka* (may be), *taxminan* (approximately), *guya* (as, if), *deyasan* (I think so), *demali* (hence), *demak* (so to say), *umumiyyatla* (generally), *avvalan* (first of all), *birincisi* (at first), *ikincisi* (the second), *manca* (I think), *sanca* (as you think), *sizca* (as you think), *bizca* (as we think), *jagin* (nearly), *garak ki* (surely), *ehtimal ki* (probably), *albatta* (of course), *umumiyyatla desak* (generally speaking), *gisa desak* (short (briefly) speaking), *bundan alava* (besides) etc. (Aslanov, 1957, p.p.172-173).

Z.A.Alizadeh in his investigations expands the environment of modality still wider. If A.Aslanov indicates modal words as the means of expression of modality, Z.A.Alizadeh adds the tense forms of the verbs, intonation, particles etc. into the ways of expression of modality (Alizadeh, 1965, p.4). Z.Alizadeh has given more importance to the grammatic features of modality. He thinks that, in any sentence

construction modality exists. Here modal words play a leading role. They bring some modal shades of meanings to the sentence.

In the Turkology, including Azerbaijan linguistics in the field of investigation of the modal words; secondary parts of speech, the particles the role of F.R.Zeynalov is great (Zeynalov, 1965m 1971, 1974, 1981).

F.R.Zeynalov considers that modality first of all is a logical category and has passed into the linguistics later on. In every sentence modality exists to a certain degree. The difference is that the means of expression of modality in different languages are different (Zeynalov, 1971).

As to the investigation of the author modality is created even by the repetition of separately taken words in the sentence. The fact that repetition was considered as one of the ways of expression of modality has found its large place in the investigation of Zeynalov.

The moods of the verb the modality of the participle and infinitive have found thin reflection in the investigation of Agazadeh on the materials of German and Azerbaijanian linguistics. The author explains the oblique mood, the suppositional mood, the conditional mood, the necessity mood, their shades of meanings, and has made attempts to find the ways of their expression in the German Language.

N.H.Aghazadeh has also tried to investigate widely the modal features of the indicative mood on the materials of Azerbaijan, German and Russian languages.

The main specific and universal features of modality have been widely investigated in the investigations of M.Javadov and Z.J.Zeynalov considers modality as a logical category and in its usage in the language he characterizes the mood, especially indicative, imperative, suppositional and oblique moods. The author considers the real modality, necessity modality and probability modality as the logical modality and he thinks them to be the components of the logical modality category (Javadov, 1959).

Z.J.Budagova in her investigations draws the explanation of the syntactic modality to the frontline plan and she has tried to explain its functions and role, its syntactic essence (Budagova, 1963, 1981).

The indicative mood, expressing the shades of meanings in the affirmation, negation of the actions in the past and future tenses is notable for these features.

In any speech situation the sentence which expresses modality is a real fact. Modality in any concrete language has concrete means of expressions. The moods of the verbs are considered as the grammatic means of expressing modality in the languages, having different systems. It is necessary to note that the moods of the verbs being considered a morphological category, it is realized in the syntactic level and in the level of sentence its real essence is revealed.

Taking this into consideration one may come to the conclusion that, it would be unwise to belong reality to one level category of the language. Beyond the sentence constructions the linguistic essence of modality remains unrevealed. One of the most widely-spread forms and mostly used forms of the moods of the verbs is the Indicative mood. The expression of modality by the indicative mood is not always explained in the same meaning by the linguists. Many of them indicate that the indicative mood of the verb and modality belong to different categories and they state that they have got any crossing line.

M.Husseynzadeh taking as a basis fact of the participation of tense and person forming suffixes with the verbs and paying attention to the time and place of their usage he divides tense and person suffixes into 4 groups:

1. The verbs missing tense and special mood features, having only person suffixes.
2. The verbs having accepted tense and person suffixes, but missing special mood features.
3. The verbs having mood peculiarities and accepting person suffixes but not accepting the tense suffixes.
4. The verbs not accepting time and person suffixes, only having special mood features.

M.Husseynzadeh relates the imperative mood to the first group, to the second group he relates the mood of the verb, to the third group he relates the oblique mood, the suppositional mood, conditional mood and continuous mood, to the third group he relates infinitive, verbal noun, participle verbal adjective and others

(M.Husseyzadeh, Morphology, p.207). All these enumerated verb moods take part in the formation of modality.

In many cases modality is investigated as a wider category than predicativity. Namely in the word and word combinations which have not yet been formulated as a sentence the shades of modal meanings show themselves. For example in the expression "*xosha galimli insan*" (*a good-looking man*) there is no predicativity, but in this word combination the speakers attitude is obviously clear. The attitude of the speaker can be given even with one word. For example, in the word "*gozalcha*" the suffix *-cha* gives the possibility for the speaker to appreciate the object on a certain view point.

We can come to the conclusion taking all above-mentioned that even the syntactic units without having predicative relations may reflect the modal attitudes of the speaker. From this point of view we can justify the idea that modality has got a wider meaning than the predicativity. But modality is associated only with predicative in the construction of a sentence. Here the actual articulation of the sentence play a great role.

In the actual articulation both predicativity and the peculiarities of modality seem to have joined together. That's why in many cases actual articulation is sometimes conditionally related to subjective modality. Predicativity is not only expressed by the modality, but by the different means (person, number, tense, types of verbs etc.). In the cases when modality is expressed by intonation predicativity is considered to be modal. This is mostly observed in nominative sentences and in the sentences consisting only of one word.

In the modern English the modal features of the future indefinite tense is observed. As it is known in English the grammatic combinations (shall, will + infinitive) creates a form referring to the Future Indefinite Tense. Here the form of the Future Indefinite Tense bears purely the peculiarities of subjective modality. The action to be taken place is considered as possible, desirable, important, but its moment of occurance is belonged to the Future Indefinite Tense. Just because of these peculiarities the specialists engaged in learning English Gramamr, name the Futuire Indefinite Tense Form formed by means of auxilary verbs shall, will as the

future modal form or special Future Tense Form (See: E.P>Ivanova. Type and time (tense) in the modern English language, L., 1961, p.p.47-48). Other investigators though accept the existence of the Future Tense show that they can't be free from the modal meanings. In Turkology and in the Azerbaijan linguistics this problem remains disputable. Still in old times M.Kazimbayov had indicated the three forms of the future tense and had marked that the oblique mood of the verb established by the suffixes “-*mali/-mali*” indicated future tense (M.A.Kazem Bek. Общая грамматика турецко-татарского языка, Казань, 1845, зю 225). But paying a close look, it is possible to observe the mood formed only by “-*mali/-mali*” does not make oblique mood, the other types of the mood of the verb such as suppositional mood, necessity mood, conditional mood also show the belonging of the action to the Future Tense. If we approach this issue still wider, we shall have to accept the fact that the other forms of future tense also express modality. Prof. S.Jafarov notes associated with this problem that in the Azerbaijan language like in all the other Turkish languages every suffix or grammatical element expresses one grammatic meaning. If any suffix or grammatical element expresses another grammatical meaning, the other meanings are considered as the secondary meanings.

So, S.Jafarov comes to such a conclusion that, all the moods of the verbs expressing future tense must be included into the system of Future Tense form of the Indicative Mood. As to him, as the future forming suffixes *-acag*, *-acak*, and *-ar*, *-ar* differ from each other on the imperatives or non-imperativeness, the suffixes *-asi/-asi*, *a/a*, *-mali/-mali*, *-sa/sa* indicating the future tense they express the shades of meanings of wish, necessity, obligation and others. The conclusion to which S.Jafarov comes is that the future tense has not only two, but six forms. These forms of the future tense possess different from each other semantic shades of meanings and being formed by the suffixes *acag/acak*, *ar/ar*, *asi/asi*, *a/a*, *mali/mali* express imperativeness, non-imperativeness, wish, obligation, necessity, condition and other meanings. But these meanings being secondary meanings give additional semantic coloring to the given meanings (See: S.Jafarov, On the introduction of the moods of the verbs in Azerbaijanian language “The teaching of Azerbaijan language and literature” The first issue, Baku, 1963, p.28).

But modality is a wider notion than the category of tense. Modality can appear in the frames of all time categories. It creates not a single contradiction when a speaker expresses his/her attitude to the actions taking place in present, past or future tenses.

The belonging of the mood to the future tense as S.Jafarov notes, expresses its general meaning. Obligation, wish, necessity and condition meanings can't be considered as general grammatical meanings. These are not the shades of meanings either, the main leading meanings are the modal meanings. Each of these modal meanings has its own special morphological features and each of them possesses differential modal meanings which can be compared with each other:

Galacayam (by all means, obligatory I'll come)

Galaram (non imperative information about the occurrence of the action in future)

Galmaliyam (obligatory I must come)

Galasiyam (it is necessary to come)

Galam (I wish to come)

Galasan (under the condition if I come)

As it is known from the examples, here modality refers to a certain tense (concretely future tense). The division of imperative and non imperative future is also conditional. Hence, much depends upon the subjective opinion of the person speaking about the action to be taken place in future, namely the action to be taken place imperatively or non-imperatively depends upon the expression of the speaker. And nobody can guarantee beforehand in what degree the speaker is objectively real. The imperative and non-imperative forms of the Present tense given in Azerbaijanian language is considered to be already stabilized morphological indications, suffixes, in Russian and German languages special lexical means carries out this task. Historically this suffix being participle suffix in Azerbaijan, receiving suffix *a/a* and future tense suffixes *cag/cak* was used as the future tense which was known till the XVI century in Azerbaijan.

Prof. M.Rahimov dealing with the relations of mood wrote that, their similar feature is that, both categories are associated with tense. In the times when the

Azerbaijani language was not formalized yet the mood had no differentiations which they possess now.

In the written specimens of architecture the suppositional mood (*a/a*) is used at present with the suffix (*ir/ir, ur/ur*) and the suffixes of non imperative suffixes are observed to be used with the suffixes (*acag/acak*) instead of old Azerbaijani suffix (*ar/ar*). It is also used in the conditional mood with suffixes (*sa/sa*) in the past tense (*di/di, du/du*), in the imperative future (*acag/acak*), in the imperative mood meaning (*ir/ir/ur/ur*), in the oblique mood (*asi/asi*), present (*ir/ir/ur/ur*) and in the future tense (*acag/acak*) functions (M.Rahimov, 1966, p.p.11-12).

The connection of the imperative future tense with the past tense strengthens the fugitivity of the action, strengthens the thought that the action should take place by all means:

Galacakdir (will come) (by all mean, exactly, obligation)

Galar (is sure to come, probable he will come)

It is necessary to mention that non-imperative future tense indication which is *ar/ar* also expresses the repeated action. This meaning being specific for all the Turkish languages bear the primary meaning. In the modern Turkish languages the indicated meaning has become partially archaic and has passed the second plan.

Generalizing the above-mentioned theses we may come to the conclusion that the indicative mood of the verbs serves the grammatical expression of modality. In the Azerbaijan language the form fertility of the indicative mood crowns with the formation of different shades of meanings of modality. Here the attitude of the speaker to the happened action, is being happened action, to be taken place action may both reflex objective reality, and in this attitude the subjective characterization can also be reflected.

CONCLUSION

1. Modality being a philosophical, logical and linguistic category expresses the attitude of the speaker to the content of the utterance and to the reality. This attitude may be objective and subjective. Depending on these two types of attitudes modality is divided into two groups – objective and subjective modality. In this respect the category modality consists of dialectical unity (integration) having found the reflection of the objective and subjective attitudes in the human thinking.

2. In the philosophical modality objective reality, the mutual relations and attitudes of the language and thinking are being investigated.

3. In the linguistic modality all the characteristic features of the language in all levels-grammatical, syntactical and semantic relations have totally accumulated.

4. Logical modality is considered the most important feature of the judgement. Objective relations in the content of the logical judgements is reflected in different forms and different degrees. Linguistic reality or non-reality coincides with logical reality and unreality.

5. The attitude to the uttered thought (its reality, unreality, truthfulness, falsehood, importance, necessity, obligation, importance, probability) is stated by the speaker and the attitudes may bear the objective and subjective features.

6. The two aspects of modality – objective and subjective modality completing each other as a whole create the general modal content of the sentence. The both aspects are valued in the same way as to the load of meanings they bear.

7. Modality is mostly referred to the level of sentence. But the sentence itself finds its explanation in the contents. So, the category of modality becoming continuously wider and wider has passed from the word level into sentence level and from the sentence level into the level of contents.

8. The category of modality is divided into two types – real and unreal. It is considered that reality is in conformity with truth, but unreality is not in conformity with truth.

9. As the logical – linguistic essence of modality is complicated, its ways of expressions are various too. Sometimes the means of expression of modality is explained on the background of lexical-grammatical field.

10. In English modality is expressed by means of moods of the verb, parenthetic clauses, modal verb + infinitive constructions, modal words etc. In the creation of modality intonation, stress, different gestures etc. play important roles.

11. In the Azerbaijan language modality formed by means of mainly morphological, lexical, lexical – syntactical, lexical phraseological, prosodic means. The difference lies in the contents of these means and in the variety of their structural types.

12. The investigation of modality has been carried out on the same scheme in Germanic and Turkish languages having different languages systems. Depending on the concrete language materials, the functions of modality in separately taken languages and the ways of expression of modality the direction (orientation) of this investigation has also been different.

13. In the Germanic languages the conception of functional-semantic field of modality, the role of modal words in establishing a text, the analytic and syntactic ways of the expression of modality, the semantic nature of modal particles, the issues of modal actualization has been still more the object of investigation.

14. In the Turkological literature the role of verb forms and moods of verbs, modal words, the role of types of intonation in establishment of the conception of modality, the syntactic repetitions have been widely analyzed.

15. In German study the category of modality has been investigated by the linguists V.Admoni, Sh.Balli, V.Oak, M.Qrepa, E.Gulupa, E.Shendels, L.Yermolayeva, E.Zveryeva, K.Krushelnitskaya. O.Panfilov, N.Petrov, A.Smirnitski, M.Blokh, H.Zandvoorf, D.Shtelling, Y.Erben, S.Borkachev, R.Grobe, J.Lyons, L.Kanner etc. from different aspects.

16. In Turkology modality has been widely investigated as a logical, philosophical and grammatical category and in this field A.N.Kononov, N.A.Baskakov, A.N.Baskakov, K.V.Musayev, F.R.Zeynalov, Z.Alizadeh, A.Aslanov, M.Rahimov, N.Direnkova, F.A.Aghayeva and others have rendered great services.

17. In the Azerbaijan linguistics which is one of the leading branches of Turkology Modality has begun to be investigated since the 50th of the XX century. A.N.Kononov in his books dedicated to the grammar of Turkish and Uzbek languages associated with the investigation of the category of modality, the works of Azerbaijan linguists have been based upon. In the works of Azerbaijanian linguists A.A.Aslanov, M.Javadov, F.R.Zeynalov, N.H.Aghazadeh, S.Jafarov, M.Husseynzadeh, Z.Alizadeh, M.Rahimov, Z.Budagova and others the category of modality has been comprehensively investigated.

REFERENCES

1. Adilov M.I., Verdiyeva Z.N., Aghayeva F.M. The Explanatory Linguistic terms. Maarif Publishing House, Baku, 1989.
2. Admoni V.G. Introduction to modern German Syntax. Moscow, Publishing House of Foreign Languages Literature, 1955.
3. Admoni V.G. About the sentence modality. Scientific notes. Leningrad, Pedagogical Institute, 1965, Volume 21, № 1, pg. 47-70.
4. Aghayeva F.A. Modality as a linguistic category. Askhabad, 1990, pg. 304.
5. Aghazadeh N.G. On the problem of the category of mood and modality in modern Azerbaijan. Publishing House of Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences, Baku, 1965.
6. Aghazadeh N.G. The issue of modal essence of forms in Indicative Mood (based on Azerbaijan, German and Russian languages). Scientific notes. APIRL named after M.F.Akhundov, Series XII, Language and Literature, № 3, 1966, Baku, pg. 33-35.
7. Akhmanova O.S. Dictionary of linguistic terms. Publishing House № 6 the 2nd. Moscow Soviet Encyclopedia. 1969.
8. Akhmanova O.S. Logical forms and their expression in language. Thinking and Language. Moscow, 1957.
9. Alizadeh Z. Modal words in Modern Azerbaijani (thesis of a candidate of science), Baku, 1963.
10. Alizadeh Z. Modal Words in Modern Azerbaijani, Maarif publishing House, Baku, 1965.
11. Angeli A.K. The issue of modal category and lexical means of its expression in Turkic languages. ADD, Moscow, 1964.
12. Aslanov A.A. Modal Words in Modern Azerbaijani. Nizami Institute of Literature and Language. Volume X, 1957.
13. Aslanov A.A. Modal words. The Grammar of Azerbaijani. Academy of Sciences of the Azerbaijan Republic, 1960.

14. Bally Sh. General linguistics and the issues of French language. Moscow Publishing House of Foreign Literature, 1965.
15. Bally Sh. French Stylistics. Moscow, Publishing House of Foreign Literature, 1961.
16. Banguoghlu P. Grammar of the Turkish Language. Ankara, 1990.
17. Barkhudarov L.S. About the superficial and deep syntax. Foreign Languages at school. 1974, № 1, pg. 25-35.
18. Baskakov A.N. Sentence in modern Turkish, Moscow, Science, 1984, pg. 200.
19. Baskakov N.A. Kara-Kalpak Language. Moscow. Publishing House of Soviet Academy of Sciences. 1951, pg. 410.
20. Baskakov N.A. Turkic languages. Moscow Publishing House of Oriental Literature, 1960, pg. 247.
21. Bashkir-Russian Dictionary. With brief Bashkir grammar appendix. Moscow State Publishing House of Foreign and National Dictionaries, 1958, pg. 804.
22. Blokh M.Y. A course in theoretical English Grammar. Moscow, Russkaya Skola, 1983.
23. Bondarko L.V. Grammatical category and context. Leningrad, Science, 1971, pg. 114.
24. Bondarenko V.N. Analytical and synthetic ways of modal expression in German. Foreign Languages at school. Publishing House "Education", 1978, № 4, pg. 31-37.
25. Bondarenko V.N. Types of modal meanings and their expression in language. Filological Sciences, 1979, № 2.
26. Bondarenko V.N. About the translation adequacy of modal meanings from German into Russian and vice versa. Foreign languages at school, 1981, № 6.
27. Borkachev S.G. Modal words of rational appraisal in modern Spanish. ADD, Moscow, 1976.

28. Brinkman I.G. Modal words in modern English. ADD, Kharkov, 1953, pg. 29.
29. Brinkmann H. Die deutsche sprache. Dusseld, 1962, p. 325.
30. Budagova Z.I. The Simple Sentence in Modern Azerbaijani. Baku, "Elm", 1963.
31. Chuvash-Russian Dictionary. Edited by Skvortsov M.I. Moscow. Publishing House "Russian Language", 1982, pg. 712.
32. Der Grosse Duden. Die Grammatic der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. M, 1959.
33. Desheriyeva R.I. About the correlation between modality and predicativity. The issues of linguistics. 1987, № 1, pg. 34-35.
34. Direnkova N.P. Grammar of the Shor Language, Moscow, 1941.
35. Dolinskaya L.D. Leksik-Syntactical way of modal expression in connection with functional perspective and rythmical text organization. Candidate Dissertation, Moscow, 1976.
36. Dyachenko O.F. About the correlation between the categories of unreality and modal categorical-non-categorical in English. Researches in Roman and German filology. Kiev, 1975, pg. 87-90.
37. Erben J. Abriss der deutschen . Grammatic Berlin, 1958.
38. English-Azerbaijani Dictionary. Compiled on the initiative and under the guidance of professor Oruj Ibrahimoglu Turksevar (Musayev). Baku, Printing House "Qismat", 2003.
39. Gak V.G. Theoretical French grammar. Syntax. Moscow, High School, 1981, pg. 208.
40. Galperin I.R. About the notion "text". The issues of linguistics, 1974, № 6.
41. Gordon E.M., Krilov I.P. Modality in Modern English. Moscow International Affairs. 1968, pg. 135.
42. Grepa M. About the essence of modality. Linguistics in Czechoslovakia. Moscow, Progress, 1978, pg. 274-301.
43. Grobe R. Die deutschen Modalverben in der neueren Forschung, Drezden, 1969, -408 p.

44. Guliga E.V., Natanzon M.D. Theory of modern German. Morphology. Moscow, 1956.
45. Guliga E.V., Shendels E.I. Grammatical-Lexical fields in modern German. Moscow. Education, 1969, pg. 184.
46. Guliga E.V. Modality of complex sentence. "The issues of German lexicology, grammar and phonetics". Moscow, 1959, pg. 95.
47. Gurevich V.A. The usage of modal words in modern German. Scientific notes of LSPI named after Getsen A.I. 1959, Volume 190, 4-1, Leningrad, pg. 82.
48. Gurevich V.A. Modal actualization of semantic components of sentence and word. Filological sciences, 1985, № 2.
49. Huseynzadeh M. Modern Azerbaijani. Maarif Publishing House, 1973.
50. Isayev A.V. The issue of opinion division of modality. Logic-Grammatical sketches. Moscow, 1961, pg. 85-96.
51. Israfilov M.M. Logics. Teaching aid, Maarif Publishing House, Baku, 1987.
52. Ivanova I.P. Mood and tense in modern English, Leningrad, 1961.
53. Jafarov S. On the problem of moods of the verb in Azerbaijani. Teaching of Azerbaijan Language and Literature. 1st issue, Baku, 1963.
54. Janpenon E.N. Modal words in modern Kazakh. ADD. Alma-Ata, 1958, pg. 18.
55. Javadov A. Modal Words. Modern Azerbaijani (Morphology), "Elm", Baku, 1980.
56. Javadov A. Some notes on Modality. Academy of Sciences of Azerbaijan, Elm, volume 2, 1959.
57. Kanner L.M. The development of preterite-present verbs by means of modal expression in German. ADD. Leningrad, 1953, pg. 19.
58. Kats J., Fodor J. The structure of a Semantic theory//language, 1963, Vol. 39, №2, p. 470.
59. Kazembek M.A. General Turkish-Tatar grammar. Kazan, 1845.
60. Khlebnikova I.B. Subjunctive Mood in modern English, Leningrad, 1959.

61. Kolshanskiy G.V. The issue of linguistic category of modality. The issues of linguistics, 1961, № 1, pg. 94-98.
62. Kononov A.N. The grammar of modern literary Turkish, Moscow-Leningrad, 1956.
63. Kononov A.N. The grammar of modern literary Turkish. Moscow, Publishing House of AS USSR, 1956, pg. 569.
64. Kononov A.N. The grammar of modern literary Uzbek, Leningrad, Publishing House of AS USSR, 1969, pg. 446.
65. Kononov A.N. The history of learning Turkic languages in Russia. Publishing House "Science", Leningrad, 1972, pg. 272.
66. Kreynovich E.M. Yukagir language. M.-L., 1959.
67. Krivonosov A.T. About the semantic nature of modal particles. Filological sciences. 1952, № 2, pg. 50-58.
68. Krushelnitskaya K.G. Sketches on German and Russian comparative grammar. Publishing House of Literature in foreign languages, 1961, pg. 265.
69. Kurlend E.E. The research of functional modality of verbs with apprehensive activity in modern English. ADD Pyatigorsk, 1977.
70. Landvoort R. W. A Handbook of English Grammar. Englewwod-cliffs: Longmans, 1961, 349 p.
71. Lomtev T.P. Sentence and its grammatical categories. Moscow. Publishing House of MSU, 1972.
72. Lyapon M.V. The issue of linguistic specificity of modality. News of AS USSR. The series of literature and language. Volume XXX, № 3, Publishing House "Sceince", 1971, pg. 230-239.
73. Lyons J. Semantics. Cambridge, 1977, Vol I, 371 p.
74. Martemyanov U.S. The Future Tense or Hypothetical Mood. Foreign Languages at schhol, 1958, № 2, pg. 15.
75. Molyavin D.V. The lexical means of modal expression in colloquial speech (based on English). Theory and practice of linguistic description of colloquial speech. Gorkiy, 1968, pg. 108-110.

76. Moskalskaya O.I. Text as a linguistic notion (Review article). Foreign languages at school. 1978, № 3.
77. Musayev K.V. The Grammar of Karaim Language, Moscow, 1964.
78. Musayev Oruj. English Grammar. Baku, 1979.
79. Modern Azerbaijani. Part III, "Elm", Baku, 1981.
80. The Naogay-Russian Dictionary. Edited by N.A.Baskakov with grammar appendix, made by N.A.Baskakov. Moscow. State Publishing House of Foreign and National Dictionaries, 1963, pg. 562.
81. Panphilov V.V. Interrelation between language and thinking. Moscow, Science, 1971, pg. 230.
82. Panphilov V.V. The category of modality and its role in the construction of sentence and opinion structure. The issues of linguistics, 1977, № 4, pg. 48.
83. Panphilov V.V. Gnosiological aspects of philosophical problems of linguistics. Moscow, Science, 1982, pg. 357.
84. Peshkovskiy A.M. Russian syntax in scientific interpretation. Moscow, 1959.
85. Petrov N.E. About the matter and volume of linguistic modality. Novosibirsk. Publishing House AS USSR, 1982, pg. 161.
86. Petsker J.N. Theory of translation and translational practice. Moscow, 1974.
87. Rahimov I., Hidayatzadeh T. Practical English Grammar. Maarif Publishing House, Baku, 1966.
88. Rahimov I., Hidayatzadeh T., Mirjafarova S. Practical English Grammar. Azernashr publishing House, Baku, 2001.
89. Ragimov M.Sh. The history of mood foundation in Azerbaijan. ADD, Baku, Publishing House of Azerbaijan Academy of Sciences, 1966, pg. 99.
90. Raspopov I.P. The issue of sentence modality. Scientific notes of Blageveshensk Pedagogical Institute, 1957, Volume 8, pg. 177-197.
91. Researches on Turkic comparative grammar. Moscow. Publishing House of Soviet Academy of Sciences, 1961, pg. 232.
92. Sadikhov G. Logics. Azertadrisnashr, Baku, 1962.

93. Savitskaya S.N. Phraseological units with modal meaning in modern English. ADD, Moscow, 1963, pg. 16.
94. Slinin J.A. Theory of modalities in modern logics. Logical semantics and modal logics. Moscow, 1967, pg. 99-147.
95. Smirnitskiy A.M. English Syntax. Moscow Publishing House of Literature in foreign languages, 1957, pg. 286.
96. Stupina T.N. The functions of modal verbs in Indirect Speech in modern German. ADD. Kalinin, 1982, pg. 16.
97. Shapiro A.B. Modality and predicativity signs of sentence in modern Russian. Scientific reports of High School. Filological sciences, 1958, № 4, pg. 20-26.
98. Shoabdurakhmanov Sh. The function words in the Uzbek language. Tashkent. 1958, pg. 24.
99. Shtelling D.A. About the heterogeneity of grammatical categories. "The issues of linguistics". 1959, № 1.
100. Torsueva N.R. Functional theory of intonation. Dissertation for a Doctor's degree. Moscow, 1975, pg. 354.
101. Turkish-Russian Dictionary. Moscow, "Russkiy Yazik" publishing House, 1977.
102. Uzbek-Russian Dictioanry. Chief editor A.K.Borovkov. Brief sketch of Uzbek grammar. Moscow. State Publishing House of foreign and national dictionaries, 1959, pg. 839.
103. Vasilenko L.I. Modal words as means of text athorization. Filological sciences, 1984, № 4, pg. 76-79.
104. Vinogradov V.V. About the category of modality and modal words in Russian, Researches in Russian grammar, Moscow, Science, 1971, pg. 56.
105. Vinogradov V.V. About the category of modality and modal words in Russian. Institute of Russian Language. Moscow-Leningrad, 1950, P. II, pg. 49.
106. Vinogradov V.V. Russian Language, Moscow, 1947.

107. Yermolayeva L.S. The issue of correlation between modality and predicativity. *Filological Sciences*, 1963, № 4, pg. 121.
108. Yermolayeva L.S. The system of means of modal expression in modern Germanic languages (based on German, English, Swedish and Icelandic languages). Candidate Dissertation, Moscow, 1962.
109. Yermolayeva L.S. The System of mood in modern German (in comparison with other Germanic languages), Moscow, 1976.
110. Yunusov Dnyamin. A Guide to English Grammar. Baku, 2004.
111. Yusifov M. Introduction to Turkology. Baku, “Nurlan”, 2001.
112. Zeynalov F.R. The particles and modal words in Modern Turkic Languages. Baku, 1965.
113. Zeynalov F.R. The Structural parts of speech in Modern Turkic Languages. Baku, Maarif publishing House, 1971.
114. Zeynalov F.R. Comparative Grammar of the Turkic Languages. Baku, ASU publishing House, 1974.
115. Zeynalov F.R. The Fundamentals of Turkology. Baku, “Maarif publishing House”, 1981.
116. Zolotova G.A. About the sentence modality in Russian. Scientific report of High School, Moscow. *High School*, 1962, № 4, pg. 65-79.
117. Zommerheldt K.E. About the role of functional-semantical fields in definite varieties. *Foreign Languages at school*, 1988, № 1, pg. 10-15.
118. Zvereva E.A. Scientific speech and modality (the system of English verb). Leningrad, Science, 1983, pg. 158.

Fikrat Fatishoglu Jahangirov was born in 1971 in Bilasuvar region of the Republic of Azerbaijan, got his high school education in 1988. In 1992 he entered the Azerbaijan State University of Languages and got his honor BA in English, and French as a minor in 1997. In 2000 he got his Ph. D. degree in Linguistics.

He has published 5 books and more than 50 articles in refereed journals. Currently he is working as an Associate Dean for the School of philology of the Azerbaijan State University of Languages.