



Preferential utterances in the system of syntactic constructions of modality

Zarnigor SIROJOVA¹

Bukhara State University

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received April 2024
Received in revised form
10 May 2024
Accepted 25 May 2024
Available online
25 June 2024

Keywords:

utterance,
will,
preference,
reality,
possibility,
optional statements,
preferential statements.

ABSTRACT

The article is devoted to an analysis of preferences expressed through evaluative modality and its syntactic constructions. The study is concerned with sentences containing preference modality, which frequently occurs in comparative constructions and only partially describes inverse relations.

2181-3701/© 2024 in Science LLC.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.47689/2181-3701-vol2-iss1/S-pp28-34>

This is an open-access article under the Attribution 4.0 International (CC BY 4.0) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/deed.ru>)

Sintaktik tizimdagi imtiyoli gaplar modallik qurilishlari

ANNOTATSIYA

Kalit so'zlar:

gap,
iroda,
afzallik,
voqelik,
imkoniyat,
ixtiyoriy gaplar,
imtiyozli gaplar.

Ushbu maqolada afzallik va xohish -istak mayllarining sintaktik tizimidagi tuzilmalarini tadqiq etadi. Afzallik modalligiga ega bo'lgan gaplar zid munosabatlarni qisman tavsiflaydi, bu qiyosiy gaplarda juda keng tarqalgan.

¹ English Literature and Translation Studies Department, Bukhara State University. E-mail: z.n.sirojova@buxdu.uz

Конструкции преференциальных выражений в системе синтаксиса

АННОТАЦИЯ

Ключевые слова:

высказывание,
воля,
предпочтение,
реальность,
возможность,
факультативные
высказывания,
преференциальные
высказывания.

Статья посвящена анализу предпочтений, выражаемых через оценочную модальность и её синтаксические конструкции. Исследование фокусируется на предложениях с модальностью предпочтения, которые часто встречаются в сравнительных конструкциях и лишь частично описывают обратные отношения.

INTRODUCTION

It has been widely accepted that the category of evaluation determines the modality. One of the categories that is exclusively human is evaluation. It is based on an individual's physical and mental makeup, his existence and emotions, how he thinks and behaves, how he views other people and the real world, and how he perceives art. Evaluation is the capacity of human awareness and cognition to establish stereotypes, understand experiences in terms of positive and bad entities, and evaluate the world around them. It permeates every facet of people's intellectual and practical endeavors, and it is utilized during both the decision-making and result-analysis stages. The ability to generalize is a feature of estimates; when applied to individual objects, they encompass classes of typical objects and situations. This leads to the stereotyping of images of phenomena in the surrounding reality and the capacity to characterize and describe some phenomena in terms of others. In general, the appearance of external objects in human perception and throughout the study process from a variety of qualitative and functional characteristics, rather than on a strictly material basis, makes assessment conceivable. This raises a philosophical and epistemological issue since it allows various people to interpret the same real-world facts in different ways, which ultimately determines how mobile and relativistic a judgment can be. In this sense, it is important to recognize the relationship between choice and assessment because it is a preference that highlights evaluation characteristics like relativity and mobility. Preferences specify those characteristics of things that allow one to identify their benefits over others in a particular context rather than emphasizing the positive or bad qualities of things per se. In a different circumstance, opposing qualities might be preferred.

METHODOLOGY

Any informative statement that is created using the conventions of a specific language and implemented in a communication context either directly or indirectly includes a judgment. We provide several arguments in favor of this thesis. First of all, the statement cannot be separated from its creator, who attempts to contribute to the communication situation by making the subjective meaning of the information being given as well as its factual content apparent to the other party. In this sense, it seems sense to ask, "Who said that?" Second, the statement fits in both stylistically and thematically with the rest of the claims that make up the oral or written speech's text. As a result, it takes on some factual and modal details from earlier utterances.

Thirdly, assessment is the process by which the speaker assigns reality (modality) to the propositional basis of a statement; that is, the speaker considers scenarios in terms of reality, possibility, desirability, preference, etc. In this sense, every word contains a component that represents the speaker's evaluation of the outside world. This section of the dissertation will examine preference statements that are part of the system of evaluative statements and share some characteristics with them, as well as some characteristics that set them apart from the kind of statements under investigation.

REFERENCE

First of all, based on content similarity, preference is linked to affirmative statements and statements with a moral and ethical bent. As it is well-known, the former uses speech to convey the speaker's personal preferences, while the latter conveys societal conceptions of what is morally right and wrong. In one way or another, the meaning of morality statements is to influence an individual to make the correct decision and lead him down the correct road. The universal and nationally specific ideas that hold knowledge about customs, moral values, and social norms of behavior create the cognitive foundation of moral and ethical statements. Therefore, moral and ethical claims reveal the values that are acknowledged inside a specific cultural group. Human choice, or a predilection for a particular life paradigm that dictates people's relationships and activities, is already present in the phenomena of value. Value phenomena are regarded by society as the most essential pillars of culture.

Philosophy and psychology have investigated the notion of "value" extensively. Values stand for universal goods, which are the basis for the good category. It is reflected in special values like life, love, health, financial security, and 37 other things. Values are different from particular preferences in that a large number of them are universal and do not correspond to individual tastes; they are the pinnacle of the value vertical and are incomparable. Preferences, on the other hand, are inherently dependent on choice and comparison. They encompass the field of endeavor wherein entities and circumstances vie with one another for the assignment of varying degrees of meaning. Therefore, despite certain semantic similarities, preference expressions differ from the listed categories in certain ways.

ANALYSIS

The speaker effectively has a wide range of options when expressing a preference, and the final decision is made by comparing them all. He may even design the circumstances in which each of them might one day come to pass; in addition, he may forecast the advantages that each one will offer. In this way, we may say that a subject may prefer entirely different things depending on the context, as different features of the same situation may be preferred under different circumstances. When the subject expresses his preferences, the circumstances are slightly different. Tastes and preferences are less prone to fluctuate when under pressure from the outside environment and are more consistent over time. However, since sympathy for one often translates into apathy or hostility against something other, they can also be discussed in terms of comparison and choice. This holds for preferences in political elections as well, when a voter can only sympathize with one candidate at a time and still prefer that one.

Preferential statements and optional statements are different in that the former do not emphasize comparison and choice. Their application is limited to circumstances where the speaker expresses his realization of a want, which is always expressed specifically in statements like "I want to eat" or "I would like to rest now" and is not

determined by selecting a particular option. Optative utterances can express multiple wishes at once, but they do not prioritize them or indicate which desire is most important. Optatives, unlike preferences, generally convey passive daydreaming as opposed to deliberate decisions. Optional statements express the speaker's wishes for the past, present, and future, regardless of their viability. They are distinguished by the speaker's coreference and the topic of desire. The causality of action and the addressing of others are optional aspects of optative statements. Expressions of want typically do not have an addressee or performer because they merely convey the speaker's feelings rather than imply implementation. They are not the same as always addressed imperative statements in this regard, where the primary goal is to order the performance of an action. Nonetheless, there are situations where optative expressions serve as imperatives and indicate a softer desire as opposed to a categorical one. Because of their similar functions, they are similar to imperative statements in this application and have the two previously mentioned characteristics.

The following optional meanings are distinguished in functional grammar theory:

- 1) the desire itself, distinguished by the hypothetical and prospective character of the intended action's execution;
- 2) a motivation-related desire that, typically, manifests in optative utterances due to the influence of illocutionary elements if the want is linked to an effect on the interlocutor;
- 3) an impractical want directed towards the past; in this instance, the affirmative statement assumes an emotive meaning of sorrow for an unaccomplished deed in the past;
- 4) Desire is connected to the meanings of condition, purpose, and comparison; these meanings are already on the edge of optativity and can be found in an optative phrase within a semantic-syntactic complex with other sentences;
- 5) desire, as an addressed act of expressing goodness, contentment, luck, prosperity, etc.

In the English language, desirability can be expressed through lexical and grammatical means. The verbs *wish* and *want* are the most common ones, as are verb combinations like *would like/love to* and *be willing to*, which indicates that the speaker is both ready and willing to fulfill their desire, even though their fulfillment does not solely depend on them.

In the broadest sense, moral and ethical statements transmit societal customs that have grown via tacit consensus in addition to expressing the need for everyone to live in harmony with one another in society. Moral and ethical claims are expressions of collective preference because they absolutize the preferences of the vast majority of individuals. The general class of normative statements, which generally dictate human behavior in diverse life situations, can be linked to moral and ethical statements that define an individual's moral sphere. From a linguistic perspective, this kind of speech has two features. The same duality of features applies to declarations of choice, which are expressed as both statements and indirect incentives (advice). It should be particularly highlighted that the speaker invariably communicates his taste in recommendations in addition to motivation. The speaker freely provides the interlocutor with his point of view, which the interlocutor may accept or reject, to rescue him from a difficult situation and offer the best option. Advice can be defined as a preference in the shape of a subtle reward. Advice can be put into practice whether the speaker is genuinely involved or when the speaker is unconcerned with whether or not his

advice is followed; in this sense, the second person will always possess the last word. However, occasionally, threats, negative outcomes, and cautions are incorporated into the advice or incentive's structure – either overtly or covertly – in the proposal. This severely restricts one's freedom of choice and occasionally encourages undesired behavior. Conjunctions like if, or, otherwise are typically used to introduce negative outcomes and covert threats. For instance:

I'd better keep my distance if I don't want to suffer.

They'd better report them to the police or / otherwise it will happen again.

The way moral, ethical, and preferential expressions are used in comparison and choice contexts explains their relative proximity. The speaker depends on his understanding of right and wrong in every situation in which they are used. "A person always tries to choose the good, strive to take the path of wisdom and virtue, and instruct others on it," observes N.D. Arutyunova, "Even though in life the bad is much more multifaceted than the good since it corresponds to unlimited opportunities to deviate from the norm, and the good is consistent with the norm." Preferential statements are statements of comparative evaluation, the semantics of which are unrelated to any particular moral absolute. This is how they differ from moral and ethical statements. Comparisons apply not only to items but also to situations, given their inherent variety. Because preference statements can be applied to an infinite number of different objects and situations, they have a greater pragmatic significance than moral and ethical statements, which have a much-restricted field of applicability. For example, in the following sentence, the game of cricket is preferred: "*Oh, I am glad you have begun to take an interest in cricket. It is simply a social necessity in England*".

One cannot help but notice the complexity of preference's specificity about other subjective modality phenomena when researching modality. Discourse actualization is a very subtle mechanism that characterizes this interaction. One can observe the intricate modal nature of preference constructions while examining one or the other. It is an example of a semantic alloy made up of the modalities of comparison, desirability, and will expression (see section 2.2 for additional details). As a result, it is frequently challenging to discern between comparisons and statements of will or want and preferences. They are all somewhat autonomous and have their linguistic standing at the same time.

We believe that the following factors distinguish them from one another:

1) Comparison sentences do not consider the utility of individual things for the subject; instead, they just highlight the unequal amount of attributes of each object. By contrasting the object with another member of the same series, the subject of the remark appears to be distancing himself from the object. Only characteristics that are directly relevant to the speaker's utility are compared in sentences using the preference modality. Preference clauses are distinguished from comparison clauses by the choice component.

2) Sentences with the modality of preference only partially describe converse relations, which are extremely frequent for comparative sentences (better / worse; bigger / smaller). It is possible to compare a semantic trait on both an increasing and decreasing scale. When someone expresses a preference, they usually describe the object of preference in terms of a rising priority attribute. This explains, for instance, why preference constructions employ the better operator rather than the worst one. It is impossible to completely rule out instances of indirect expression of preference, though, in which outlining a disadvantage of one option suggests an advantage of another.

3) Any qualitative trait can be used to compare an object in a comparison statement. This suggests that contrasts show the broadest. For example, *Dick is more sensible than John, the latter being more sensitive.*

Preference expressions differ in that they do not emphasize an object's intrinsic qualities. Preference solely expresses an object's priority attribute as seen from the speaker's perspective, hence its primary meaning in language is "good for someone" or "better for someone," rather than "higher," "lower," "slimmer," etc. But we must never lose sight of the fact that comparison is at the core of all preference.

4) Unlike preference sentences, which lack thematic consistency, comparative sentences have a consistent set of objects to compare. Generally speaking, the things under comparison are from the same category of phenomena. Conversely, a single metric does not apply to objects of desire; in this case, a universal criterion is not used for comparison. What matters in this instance is not the alternatives' thematic coherence but rather the fact that they are all personal.

DISCUSSION

The meaning of the statement of will is another specific facet of the modality of choice. Preference, in a profound, philosophical sense, is always related to the idea of insatiability, a person's perpetual unhappiness with the current condition of affairs, as N.D. Arutyunova correctly points out individuals are continuously faced with decision-making crossroads, where they must tilt the balance towards the scenario that best fits their circumstances. In this sense, the subject must undoubtedly be aware of the benefits of one alternative over the other because, if both scenarios are perfectly equal in terms of their utility for the subject, then he will not be able to make a choice. In other words, the inequality of alternatives in a situation of choice is always noted.

The closeness of language models of expressing one's will and choice (evaluative assertions of will and preference) suggests that decision-making processes (preference) and their actualization in particular actions (expression of will) are inextricably linked. To a certain extent, preference is a prerequisite for volition as a level of reasoning that guards against rash and careless decisions. When it comes to language expression, volition can be viewed as a reduced-preference structure where the logic behind the action in issue is easily reconstructable. In English, the verbs *shall, will, should, and would* with inf. are forms of the future tense that are used to indicate will. Examples of word combinations that express will include "going to do," "being willing to do," "determined to do," and so on. The expression of will is frequently stated lexically – that is, by employing the verb *decide* or the term *to make a decision* – in the description or narration of historical events.

REFERENCE:

1. Sirojova Zarnigor Nasriddinovna. (2024). THE PROBLEM OF MODALITY IN LINGUISTICS. International Multidisciplinary Journal for Research & Development, 11(05). Retrieved from <http://www.ijmrd.in/index.php/imjrd/article/view/1417>
2. Nasriddinovna, Z. S. (2023). Conceptual Analysis of Word Formation and Sentences. INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF LANGUAGE LEARNING AND APPLIED LINGUISTICS, 2(5), 46-50.

3. Sirojova, Z. (2022). Functional Study of Syntactical Relations of Compound Sentences in Uzbek Linguistics. ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu.Uz), 22(22). извлечено от http://journal.buxdu.uz/index.php/journals_buxdu/article/view/8069
4. Zokirova N. TARJIMADA LINGVOKOGNITIV DUNYO MANZARASI, LINGVISTIK ONG VA LINGVISTIK ANGLASHNING O" ZARO MUNOSABATLARI //ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. uz). – 2023. – Т. 29. – №. 29.
5. Subxonova, M. (2023). DINIY DISKURSDA METAFORIK BIRLIKLAR TALQINI VA FUNKSIONALLIGI. Talqin Va Tadqiqotlar, 1(19). извлечено от <https://talqinvatadqiqotlar.uz/index.php/tvt/article/view/137>
6. Markova, Y. S., & Ruziyeva, N. X. (2024). REQUEST LENGTH AS POLITENESS MATTERS. SCHOLAR, 2(2), 227–231. Retrieved from <https://researchedu.org/index.php/openscholar/article/view/6140>
7. Markova Yelena Sergeevna, & Ruziyeva Nilufar Xafizovna. (2024). The Role of Politeness in Communication. Miasto Przyszłości, 44, 239–242. Retrieved from <https://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/2413>
8. Sergeevna , M. Y. ., & Savriyevna , Z. N. . (2024). Translation as a Bridge Between Cultures: a Multidisciplinary Perspective. Miasto Przyszłości, 48, 80–84. Retrieved from <http://miastoprzyszlosci.com.pl/index.php/mp/article/view/3414>
9. Zokirova N. TARJIMADA LINGVOKOGNITIV DUNYO MANZARASI, LINGVISTIK ONG VA LINGVISTIK ANGLASHNING O" ZARO MUNOSABATLARI //ЦЕНТР НАУЧНЫХ ПУБЛИКАЦИЙ (buxdu. uz). – 2023. – Т. 29. – №. 29.
10. Tolibovna, S. Z. (2024). FIRST LANGUAGE INTERFERENCE IN LEARNING A FOREIGN LANGUAGE. EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research (IJMR), 10(1), 311-313.
11. Бондарко А.В. Теория функциональной грамматики. – Л.: Наука, 1990. -263 с.
12. Бондарко А.В., Беляева Е.И., Бирюлин Л.А. Теория функциональной грамматики. Темпоральность. Модальность. – АН СССР, Ин-т языкознания. – Л.: Наука, 1990. – 262 с.
13. Арутюнова Н.Д. Логическая структура препозитивного значения // Язык и мир человека. – М.: «Наука», 1999. – С. 449-452.
14. Арутюнова Н.Д. Модальные и семантические операторы //Облик слова. – М, 1997.- С. 22-40.
15. Арутюнова Н.Д. Об объекте общей оценки // Вопросы языкознания. – 1985.-№3.-С. 13-24.
16. Арутюнова Н.Д. Типы языковых значений. Оценка. Событие. Факт. – М.: Наука, 1988.-341 с.
17. Блох М.Я. Проблема тождества предложения в свете соотношения понятия синтаксиса, семантики и информации // Вопросы языкознания. – 1997.- №3.-С. 73-85.