SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

PRAGMATIC STUDY OF THE CONCEPT OF FAMILY AND MODAL STRUCTURES

Nazarova Dilrabo Ne'matjon qizi
PhD (DSc) Basic Doctoral Researcher, Namangan State University, Uzbekistan

ABSTRACT
This article provides a pragmalinguistic analysis of the components within the macrosystem of the modality category, as well as the elements of the microsystems that constitute it—namely, grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic units. Furthermore, the study explores the pragmatic interrelation between the concept of "family" and the category of modality.
KEYWORDS: *Modality, Grammatical Category, Semantic Category, Pragmatic Category, Modal Structure, Empirical, Theoretical Knowledge, Mental Knowledge, Methodological Reflection, Family Concept, Speech Acts.*

In the historical development of linguistic science, linguistics has passed through the stages of empirical cognition, theoretical cognition, and theoretical-mental cognition. Contemporary world linguistics is currently developing within the stage of theoretical-mental cognition. This represents a natural process and a continuously progressive path of development inherent in every language system.

Similarly, when examining the development of Uzbek linguistics, it can be stated that it initially evolved within descriptive and theoretical stages. Modern Uzbek linguistics, however, is now progressing beyond the purely theoretical level, advancing into explanatory (explanatory-interpretive) and meta-theoretical stages. On this basis, the development of Uzbek linguistics can be conditionally divided into three stages:

1. The Empirical Stage of Uzbek Linguistics
The empirical stage covers the period from the earliest times up to the 1950s of the twentieth century. The rich scholarly heritage produced during this period—particularly the monumental linguistic works of scholars such as Al-Farabi, Ibn Sina, Al-Biruni, Mahmud al-Kashgari, Mahmud al-Zamakhshari, Alisher Navoi, Zahiriddin Muhammad Babur, Abdurauf Fitrat, Q. Ramazon, and A. Zohiriy—constitutes the foundation of what is referred to as "classical Uzbek linguistics." During this stage, alongside the study of linguistic phenomena and grammar across all branches of linguistics, a vast amount of empirical linguistic data was accumulated.

2. The Theoretical Stage of Uzbek Linguistics
The theoretical stage spans from the 1960s to the end of the twentieth century. During this period, Uzbek phonetics, lexicology, phraseology, dialectology, morphology, and syntax were subjected to deep theoretical analysis and interpretation. New approaches to the study of Uzbek grammar and linguistic phenomena were introduced, particularly systemic, structural, and functional frameworks. In general, during this stage, Uzbek linguistics was established as a fully scientific linguistic discipline.

3. The Metatheoretical Stage of Uzbek Linguistics
The metatheoretical stage primarily corresponds to the period of national independence. Prior to independence, it was not possible to discuss new methods and approaches in Uzbek linguistics due to restrictive language policies and dominant ideological constraints of the Soviet era.

During the years of independence, the scholarly works and theoretical ideas of researchers such as A. Khodjiev, Sh. Rahmatullayev, A. Nurmonov, N. Mahmudov, H. Ne'matov, R. Rasulov, R. Sayfullaeva, T. Mirzaqulov, O. Bozorov, Sh. Shahobiddinova, Kh. Usmonova, M. Qurbonova, Sh. Iskandarova, D. Lutfullaeva, A. Sobirov, D. Nabiyeva, and M. Hakimov have occupied a special place in the metatheoretical development of Uzbek linguistics.

In particular, innovative interpretations in the works of Academician A. Khodjiev concerning morphemics and word formation in Uzbek grammar, Sh. Rahmatullayev's *Modern Literary Uzbek Language*, A. Nurmonov and N. Mahmudov's *Theoretical Grammar of the Uzbek Language. Syntax*, A. Nurmonov, Sh. Shahobiddinova, Sh. Iskandarova, and D. Nabiyeva's *Theoretical Grammar of the Uzbek Language. Morphology*, as well as H. Ne'matov, R. Sayfullaeva, and M. Qurbonova's *Foundations of Structural Syntax of the Uzbek Language*, reflect new scientific paradigms in linguistic description.

Similarly, the works such as A. Nurmonov's *Problems of Systemic Study of Uzbek Syntax*, N. Mahmudov's *Semantic–Syntactic Asymmetry in Simple Sentences of Uzbek*, T. Mirzaqulov's *Issues of Morphemic Paradigmatics and Syntagmatics in Uzbek*, R.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Sayfullaeva's *Formal-Functional Interpretation of Compound Sentences in Uzbek*, M. Qurbonova's *Formal-Functional Approach in Uzbek Linguistics and Interpretation of Simple Sentence Structure*, A. Nurmonov, N. Mahmudov, A. Ahmedov, and S. Solixo'jaeva's *Semantic Syntax of the Uzbek Language*, H. Ne'matov and R. Rasulov's *Foundations of Systemic Lexicology of Uzbek*, Sh. Iskandarova's *Study of Uzbek Lexicon as a Semantic Field (Microfield of Personhood)*, Sh. Shahobiddinova's *Morphology of Uzbek in the Interpretation of the Generality–Specificity Dialectic*, A. Sobirov's *Systemic Study of Uzbek Lexical Layer as a System of Systems*, D. Lutfullaeva's *Problems of Semantic–Syntactic Modeling of Sentences*, and D. Nabiyeva's *Manifestations of the Generality–Specificity Dialectic Across Linguistic Levels* all demonstrate that Uzbek linguistics is developing on the basis of poly-paradigmatic and pluralistic approaches.

In conclusion, it can be argued that one of the greatest achievements of the independence period for Uzbek linguistics is methodological pluralism. Until the 1970s–1980s, methodological monism dominated Uzbek linguistics, as the discipline was constrained by Soviet ideological pressure. This significantly limited the free and multi-dimensional development of linguistic research.

Following independence, a new era of methodological renewal began. First, the Uzbek language started to be studied based on its own internal structure and nature, rather than through the prism of other linguistic systems. Second, Uzbek linguistics liberated itself from artificial doctrines such as Marrism, Marxism, and Leninism and began to develop independently. Third, it began to evolve not on the basis of a single ideology or fixed methodological framework, but through diverse paradigms and research methods.

In the twenty-first century, linguistics increasingly requires methodological transformation and paradigm shifts. In particular, alongside dialectical and systemic methodologies, the application of scientific paradigms such as synergetics, hermeneutics, and phenomenology to linguistic research has become an urgent and central issue.

Thomas Kuhn's concept of "scientific revolutions" in the development of science arises from the need for methodological reflection. Any discipline develops for a long period on the basis of a particular paradigm; however, a stage eventually emerges when the previously accepted "ideal" paradigm can no longer provide solutions to existing problems. At this point, scholars radically re-examine the path that has been taken and engage in deep reflection on the reasons why certain problems remain unresolved. This process of critical re-evaluation in science is referred to as **methodological reflection**.

Today, linguistic units of language and speech are being re-evaluated and analyzed on the basis of methodological reflection, which has become increasingly relevant. In this context, there is also a growing need to analyze the category of modality using the same methodological framework. This is because, in previous studies, modality has predominantly been interpreted as a grammatical and semantic category. As a result, the category of modality has not yet received a fully adequate interpretation, and its complete semantic scope has not been sufficiently represented.

In our view, if the category of modality is analyzed from a **pragmalinguistic perspective**, this theoretical gap can be addressed. In anthropolinguistic research, linguistic phenomena are studied as an integrated whole, inseparable from the human factor, and in terms of their mutual relations. In this framework, analysis is carried out through the models "human–world–language," "world–human–language," and "language–human–world." This approach makes it possible to identify a **pragmatic component of modality** in addition to its grammatical and semantic components.

The fact that modality is closely related to the human factor indicates that it exists in all languages of the world. Therefore, Y. G. Testelets identifies modality as a universal linguistic category expressed in one form or another across all languages. According to him, "modality includes a set of interrelated meanings (lexical, connotative, emotive, occasional, deictic, pragmatic) corresponding to various relations between the speaker, the listener, and the speech situation; that is, it reflects not the reported situation itself, but the features of the communicative situation and speech strategy. Modality is determined within the sentence, since the sentence typically functions as a unit of communication" [1, p. 736]. Thus, modality reflects a complex of pragmatic components such as human cognition, interpersonal relations, and communicative context.

As V. V. Vinogradov rightly emphasizes, the universality of modality is manifested in its belonging to the core linguistic categories and its realization in various forms across different language systems [2, pp. 53–87]. Therefore, modality is a grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic category that has its own interpretation in each language, and the means of its expression also vary significantly.
Currently, the study of the functional aspects of language has become one of the most urgent issues in linguistics. "An analysis proceeding from meaning to form," writes A. V. Bondarko, "makes it possible not only to identify the targeted nature of a given semantic category but also to discover the various linguistic means expressing this meaning, especially complex means not freely represented at grammatical-lexical, grammatical-contextual, morphological, lexical, and syntactic levels" [3, p. 15]. This approach represents a pragmalinguistic method of analysis.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

The relationship between language and logic has entered a new stage of development, and as a result, linguistic and speech units are increasingly being analyzed within a new pragmatic paradigm. In this regard, the category of modality has also been examined through this approach, and it has been clarified that it is one of the linguistic phenomena closely connected with the logical structure of thought and simultaneously an object of study in pragmatics.

One of the central concepts of pragmatics is modality. The evaluative semantic component in the structure of linguistic units is considered an object of study in linguistic pragmatics. Although Uzbek linguistics includes several studies devoted to evaluative means at different language levels (A. G‘ulomov, A. Hojiev, R. Qo‘shurov, R. Rasulov, Yo. Tojiev, R. Xadyatullaev, Z. Ma’rufov, A. Abdullaev, G. Qambarov, etc.), modality as an integrated category has not yet been the subject of a monographic study in Uzbek linguistics. This demonstrates the relevance of the topic for contemporary Uzbek linguistics and the necessity of its pragmatic analysis.

The category of modality is primarily realized in speech and communicative situations. Communication is not random or disorganized; rather, it is constructed by interlocutors based on their conscious and implicit motivations and intentions. Therefore, this process should be studied within the framework of **speech act theory**.

The concept of modality (Latin *modus* – manner, way) was introduced by Aristotle and interpreted as a mode of existence of an object or realization of a phenomenon. In his works *Metaphysics* and *Analytics*, modality is used in the sense of modality of judgment and is associated with the speaker’s degree of commitment to the truth of a statement. Aristotle distinguished modal meanings such as “necessary,” “possible,” “impossible,” and “contingent” (translation is ours). Later, these ideas were used as a foundation for defining verbal moods in linguistics.

Thus, the study of speech acts such as locutionary, illocutionary, and perlocutionary acts in communicative contexts should be examined as part of modal pragmatics in relation to other linguistic phenomena.

In logic, modality expresses the speaker’s attitude toward the proposition. In philosophy, it is used in the form of modal judgments. A modal judgment reflects the relationship between subject and predicate in terms of necessity (strong/definite), possibility (weak/probable), or negation [4, p. 273]. Medieval philosophers developed various interpretations of modality. Kant identified three types of modality: actuality-oriented, necessity-oriented, and possibility-oriented modality.

In classical logic, modality is treated as a classification of judgments: assertoric (reality), apodictic (necessity), and problematic (possibility). During the Renaissance, logical grammar emerged, and Leibniz laid the foundations of mathematical logic. His ideas on logic principles and modality remain important in contemporary logical research.

In modern linguistics, modality has become one of the most important and comprehensive concepts in cognitive linguistics. This necessitates interpreting modality within cognitive approaches, particularly through conceptual analysis. Since every modality is linked to human cognition, it is realized in language through verbalizers, which in turn form conceptual systems. Therefore, conceptual analysis is required.

In the 19th–20th centuries, modality began to attract increasingly strong attention from linguists as one of the essential properties of the language system. Within the context of interdisciplinary integration of sciences, this term also started to be employed in other fields and subsequently established its own place in linguistics. In linguistic studies, modality has traditionally been interpreted as one of the most complex and controversial concepts, characterized by a variety of approaches and definitions in accordance with long-standing scholarly tradition.

F. Bruno distinguished three groups of modality: the modality of thought, emotion, and volition. Within each of these states, two categories can be identified: reality and possibility. However, Bruno’s classification largely reflects an interpretation consistent with classical logical understandings of modality.

In Western European linguistics, the Swiss scholar Ch. Bally is considered the first to introduce the concept of modality into linguistic science. According to his theory, modality manifests itself as the speaker’s emotions and communicative intention. He identified three general types of modality: intellectual judgment, affective (positive and negative) evaluation, and volition.

The conceptual foundation of modality studies in linguistics is grounded in certain principles derived from logical and philosophical theories of modality. Clarifying the logical and philosophical essence of modality is essential for its linguistic interpretation. For this reason, we have briefly reviewed relevant philosophical and logical perspectives on this category above. The study of modality in linguistics is multidimensional and is approached from various theoretical standpoints.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

A detailed description of modality can be found in the works of Academician V. V. Vinogradov. He examined the historical development of this category, identified the range of its expressive means, and analyzed its scope and structural composition. According to him, every utterance reflects a relation to reality. Vinogradov draws a distinction between logical and linguistic modality, emphasizing the central position of modality in language systems, since reality and emotional expression are closely interconnected. He further argues that any statement, thought, emotion, or motivation constitutes modality insofar as it expresses a speaker's attitude toward reality. In his view, modality encompasses various grammatical means that express the relationship between speech semantics and objective reality.

M. A. Petrova notes that K. M. Galkina-Fedoruk interprets modality as a logical reflection of the speaker's attitude toward reality, expressed in terms of certainty or uncertainty in the proposition, without distinguishing between logical and linguistic modality. Another Russian linguist, I. R. Galperin, views modality as a category inherent in language, particularly in speech, and therefore interprets it as an essential feature of communicative processes.

According to E. N. Alieva, modality is characterized by its constant presence in the sentence and its function of determining sentence meaning; it performs the role of logical and grammatical gradation of utterance meaning and is divided into objective and subjective modality. Furthermore, modality is equally relevant in the formation of both grammatical sentences and logical judgments.

In addition, modality intersects with various forms of emotional expression (such as anger, surprise, threat, etc.) and demonstrates partial interdependence with them. As V. V. Vinogradov notes, although emotional responses and modal evaluation of reality are closely interconnected, a clear distinction must nevertheless be drawn between them. Modal meanings are expressed through various introductory constructions and are associated with logical evaluation, emotional assessment, and stylistic features of speech.

According to N. Yu. Shvedova, emotional attitudes toward messages are considered modal; however, some scholars exclude emotional-expressive attitudes from the category of modality. G. A. Zolotova defines modality primarily as an expression of the speaker's attitude toward the truth or falsity of a statement and distinguishes three types of relations: (1) the relation of propositional content to reality from the speaker's perspective, (2) the relation of the speaker to the content of the utterance, and (3) the relation between the subject and the predicative feature.

In Ch. Bally's interpretation, modality functions as a syntactic category, primarily expressed through modal verbs that convey the speaker's judgment about the subject of speech. As a proponent of a broad understanding of modality, Bally regarded it as the "core of the sentence" and included within it modal verbs, mood, intonation, interrogative and imperative forms, gestures, facial expressions, exclamations, and other means expressing thought, emotion, and volition.

Subsequently, relying on Bally's concept, a number of Russian and foreign scholars began to distinguish communicative sentence types as part of modal meaning. T. B. Alisova differentiated communicative and subjective-evaluative modality, while E. Benveniste argued that modal sentence forms encode communicative functions such as assertion, interrogation, and command, reflecting the speaker's intention to influence the interlocutor. He also distinguished three types of modality: possibility, impossibility, and necessity.

According to Ya. G. Testelets, modality serves to express a set of interconnected meanings that reflect various relations between addresser and addressee. Modality is defined at the level of sentence semantics, as the sentence is generally considered the basic unit of communication. The broad interpretation of modality is widely acknowledged in contemporary linguistics. Significant contributions to modality research have been made by V. G. Gak, V. Z. Panfilov, I. P. Raspopov, T. P. Lomtev, N. Yu. Shvedova, R. G. Sibagatov, Ch. Bally, V. V. Vinogradov, T. B. Alisova, and G. A. Zolotova.

In pragmalinguistic conceptual studies, verbalizers of the "family concept" constitute one of the components of the modality system. In conceptual research, a concept is understood as a unit of human cognition, a cognitive structure of knowledge representation. Human thought is not inherently verbal; it is expressed through universal conceptual codes. Concepts form a person's conceptual sphere (conceptosphere). Language serves as one of the means of accessing and verbalizing human cognition and conceptual structures. Concepts may or may not be verbalized; many remain non-verbal in individual cognition.

Concepts become verbalized in communication through lexical, phraseological, syntactic, and paralinguistic means. Each concept has a structured cognitive organization based on cognitive classifiers and features that form conceptual fields. Concepts possess national, social, general, and individual dimensions.

The family concept also has such a structure and is expressed through various linguistic units. It is a socially significant concept that exists in the collective and individual cognition of every nation. The pragmatic analysis of modality expressed through family relations can shed light on this issue. Family relations are represented linguistically through conceptual structures, phraseological units, and proverbs.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

Family relations primarily include relations between father and mother, parents and children, and children and society. The father and mother constitute the core components of the family concept, socially manifested as husband and wife relations. Their interaction is realized through linguistic signs in communication, which can be classified into phonetic-phonological, lexical-semantic, grammatical (morphological and syntactic), pragmatic (implicature, presupposition, deixis), and paralinguistic (prosody, gestures, facial expressions) means.

The modality category expressed in the family concept is realized through diverse linguistic mechanisms. Phonetic-phonological means can be divided into vowels, consonants, and phonation types from a linguistic perspective, and into vocalism-pragmatic, consonant-pragmatic, and prosodic types from an extralinguistic perspective. Gender-related features must also be considered in this analysis, as they manifest distinctly in modal markers.

For example, in the utterance "Turmangiz" ("Please stand up"), addressed by Otabek to Zaynab, the use of the second-person plural suffix -ngiz reflects politeness and social distancing. This linguistic form encodes multiple pragmatic meanings.

The communicative intention behind Otabek's utterance reflects his strong ethical integrity, family-based cultural norms, his attitude toward traditional customs considered incompatible with rational upbringing, his sense of generational responsibility, and his specific attitude toward Zaynab. These pragmatic meanings are not realized solely through affixation; rather, they emerge under the influence of pragmatic situation, communicative strategy, discourse pragmatics of the narrative structure, and prosodic means. In this context, both the range of pragmatic impact (the pragmatic "diapason") and the set of influencing pragmatic factors (the pragmatic "aura") are involved. The affix functions as a linguistic marker indicating these pragmatic meanings.

From the perspective of narrative pragmatics, Otabek would conventionally be expected to respond to Zaynab in a more emotionally distant or even disapproving manner. However, within the pragmatic structure of the narrative, information regarding Otabek's upbringing in a cultured, educated, and ethically refined family already exists in the reader's pragmatic consciousness as a background (stored) concept. Since earlier events remain cognitively active in the reader's interpretive framework, the author does not explicitly reiterate them. Thus, a single utterance by Otabek activates modal relations, where the illocutionary force of speech is realized in accordance with discourse strategy requirements.

In the utterance *"Xaytobur, sizning ustingizdan bir ish qilib qo'ydik"* ("Well then, we have taken some action concerning you"), various modal attitudes of Yusufbek Haji can be observed. The utterance reflects embarrassment in the presence of his son, as well as hesitation and anticipatory evaluation of Otabek's possible reaction. Similarly, Otabek's response—*"Yaxshi ota-onalar o'z farzandlari ustidan nomaqbul ish qilmaydilar"* ("Good parents do not act improperly toward their children")—also demonstrates modality embedded in evaluative and ethical positioning.

In the statement *"Biz seni unashtirib qo'ydik"* ("We have engaged you"), spoken by O'zbek Oyim, modality emerges in the form of assertiveness, emotional directness, lack of hesitation, and pragmatic forcefulness. In both utterances, prosodic features, facial expressions, situational context, and lexical selection jointly contribute to the construction of modality. Accordingly, the study of the family concept should be conducted in close relation to the analysis of modality as a linguistic category. Therefore, it is necessary to first establish a pragmalinguistic evaluation of this category.

In conclusion, the category of modality should be studied as a macrosystem across three dimensions.
First, in the grammatical aspect, modality functions as a grammatical microsystem. This microsystem integrates morphological and syntactic elements and, through their interaction, forms a grammatical macrosystem. Therefore, modality in its grammatical dimension may be defined as a grammatical category encompassing both morphological and syntactic subsystems.

Second, in the semantic aspect, modality includes elements such as anger, denial, trust, doubt, affirmation, and negation. These semantic components form an integrated system through mutual relations, thereby constituting a semantic macrosystem. Hence, modality can also be defined as a semantic category.

Third, in the pragmatic aspect, modality reflects both objective and subjective attitudes of the speaker toward the propositional content expressed in communication. These attitudes interact and form a unified system, resulting in a pragmatic macrosystem. Therefore, modality may also be considered a pragmatic category.

Overall, modality is simultaneously a grammatical, semantic, and pragmatic category. Its multidimensional analysis within an integrated framework helps to clarify its complex nature. The interpretation of objective and subjective modality through the lens of the family concept requires a separate, dedicated study.

SJIF Impact Factor (2026): 8.863| ISI I.F. Value: 1.241| Journal DOI: 10.36713/epra2016 ISSN: 2455-7838(Online)
EPRA International Journal of Research and Development (IJRD)
Volume: 11 | Issue: 5 | May 2026 - Peer Reviewed Journal

REFERENCES

1. *Testelets, Y. G. (2001). Introduction to General Syntax. Moscow. 736 p.*
2. *Vinogradov, V. V. (1975). On the category of modality and modal words in Russian. In Studies in Russian Grammar: Selected Works (pp. 53–87). Moscow: Nauka.*
3. *Bondarko, A. V. (1990). Modality: Introductory remarks. Leningrad: Nauka. 15 p.*
4. *Philosophy: Encyclopedic Dictionary (2004). Tashkent. p. 273.*
5. *Bruno, F. (1965). La pensée et la langue. Paris: Masson. 511 p.*
6. *Bally, Ch. (1955). General Linguistics and Issues of the French Language. Moscow. 416 p.*
7. *Vinogradov, V. V. (1975). Selected works. Moscow: Nauka. 560 p.*
8. *Petrova, M. A. (2007). Types of Non-modal Meanings of Modal Predicates. Moscow. 235 p.*
9. *Alieva, E. N. (2010). Functional-semantic category of modality... Doctoral dissertation abstract. Moscow. 50 p.*
10. *Bally, Ch. (1955). General Linguistics and Issues of the French Language. Moscow. 416 p.*
11. *Benveniste, É. (1974). General Linguistics. Moscow: Progress. 447 p.*
12. *Testelets, Y. G. (2001). Introduction to General Syntax. Moscow. 698 p.*
13. *Rahimov, A. U. (2009). Quantitative method study of fusion in Uzbek language. Tashkent. p. 30.*