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Abstract: This article is devoted to the analysis of modal verbs and modal words in speech, semantic features, similarities and differences between them, their use in speech, grammatical analysis of modal verbs in English and modality Dedicated to collecting the studied sources in the category, identifying contradictions in them, finding shortcomings and filling them.
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Modality is the basic unit of speech, the most important component of sentence semantics. In linguistics, modality is usually understood as the relation of the content of a sentence to an objective being and the relation of the speaker to the content of a sentence. The modality category includes a variety of tools to help ensure speech modality. V.Z. Panfilov noted that, the modality category includes different meanings in terms of their functional function, belonging to the language structure, as a result of which this category is deprived of certain clarity. This even casts doubt on the existence of modality as a separate language category. In particular, IP Raspapov thinks about modality and says that there is no category of modality as a category in the purely grammatical sense. In his opinion, it is more appropriate to talk about the modal quality of speech, rather than about the category of modality. T.P. Lomtev has a similar opinion about this category. In his view, the grammatical category of modal character constitutes a system, not “a single grammatical category”. Such ideas about modality are not accidental, of course. According to the traditional study of modality, it is really difficult to describe. The meaning of modality is observed at different levels of the language system. The means of expressing modality are also diverse. Since there is no single methodology for identifying these tools in linguistics, the means of expressing modality are differentiated on the basis of materials from different languages. In particular, according to N.Yu. Shvedova, modal means include inclination, separate constructions of a sentence, intonation, word structure, repetition, loading, exclamation, introduction (modal) words and sentences.

On the basis of the materials of the Turkic languages, the following modal means are shown: separate devices of prepositions, tenses and personal pronouns, prepositions, word order, intonation, interrogative pronouns in the prepositional function, stimuli, introductory words and sentences, it can be seen that under this category there are different means: morphological (tendency, tense, person affixes), lexical (different groups of words), syntactic (separate speech devices word order, repetition and phonetic means i.e. intonations) are introduced. The combination of such a variety of tools under one category has, of course, given rise to some objections among linguists. Therefore, an attempt was made to find a common character that would unite these tools. All of these tools have their own function in a sentence. This symbol, the syntactic symbol, was to some extent the basis for combining the above means. Accordingly, modal means are: 1) constructive-syntactic; 2) morphological-syntactic; 3) can be divided into intonation-syntactic groups [56.17-20]. The syntactic status of all modal devices seems to be the basis for showing the general structure of these tools. However, this syntactic sign, which is the basis for unification in a particular place, loses its power in the differentiation of modal means. That is why RG Sibagatov shows that the definition of the category of modality should be based on different categories of hierarchy. In fact, there are different categories of levels in linguistics, which are formed by uniting the units of different levels around a common concept. The content
of different hierarchical categories is a whole semantic field, which includes grammatical and lexical categories that are different from each other and at the same time united under one concept. In this sense, the modality category really belongs to a different hierarchy category according to the plan. Units of different levels are grouped under one concept - the concept of modality. Hence, the modality category exists objectively as a language category. The general definition of modality is approached in linguistics from the point of view of the plan of meaning, that is, the sign of the relationship is taken into account. However, as V.Z.Panfilov points out, in linguistics there is no uniformity on the essence of this category, its relation of thought modality, types of speech modality, the most important issues related to the relation of modality to predicative.

Proponents of the nominative aspect of speech divide the sentence into two parts, dictum and modus. Dictation is the objective content of a syntactic device, that is, a proposition. It is not enough to express a dictation (proposition) in order for a certain syntactic device to form a sentence. According to Bally, it becomes a thing only when the mode is added. So modus is the most important part of speech, without which speech cannot be formed. Because it cannot accentuate modality. It modifies all the features of the sentence except the dictation. That is why Fillmore expresses the sentence formula as C = M + P (C-sentence, M-modality, P-proposition) - (dictum). In this sense, the modes of communication are question, command, emotional, subjective, modal, and so on. Modality was interpreted in the same way in V. Vinogradov's 1950 article "On the categories of modality and modalities in Russian", and his concept greatly influenced subsequent research on the problem of modality in Soviet linguistics. Under modality by V. Vinogradov and his followers:

1) types of communicative meanings: types of sentences that differ in meaning, question, command,
2) different types of statements in terms of affirmation and denial;
3) The emotional attitude of the speaker to the content of the speech and a number of other meanings.

Continuing T. Alisova and Sh. Balli's views on dictum and modus, he says about modality: "The predicative nature of any sentence consists of two levels: the first reflects the subject-predicate relationship of the denotation (dictum), and the second represents the attitude of the speaker". GA Zolotova distinguishes the third type of modal relationship - the relationship between the action and its agent. The first type of relation (objective modality) is the relation of the content of a sentence to existence in terms of reality-unreality, conformity or inconsistency. Objective modality is expressed at the level of syntactic division of a sentence.

Its formal features are:
Verb inclinations (conditional, command, conditional, execution), etc.; special modal verbs: to want, want, etc.;
Lexical means: necessary, necessary, necessary, compulsory, necessary, etc. Objective modality, in turn, has different meanings:

The relation of the content expressed in the sentence to the existence. It is expressed through verb tenses and tone (in nominative verbs) and distinguishes between real (noreal) content. The subject's attitude toward "his" actions. This modality combines four subcategories:
Accuracy.
Characterized by zero;
Opportunity It is expressed by auxiliary verbs such as to receive, to be.

necessity, necessity, necessity. This meaning of modality is expressed in words such as necessary, necessary, necessary, necessary, necessary, desire This meaning is expressed by special modal verbs (wish, desire, etc.).
All of the types of modality listed above belong to the objective modality and belong to the dictum.

The second type of attitude (subjective modality) is the attitude of the speaker to the content of the sentence, such as trust, suspicion, certainty, consent. Subjective modality refers to the speaker's attitude to the content expressed in the sentence and enters the mode. Subjective modality is expressed by a special modal word that comes in the introductory word function or other words in the modal function. Through subjective modality, in turn, the speaker manifests different attitudes to his opinion: belief (of course I will come), affirmation (correct, I will come), suspicion (probably I will come), pity (sorry, I'm coming) and so on.

The third type of modality includes the meanings of possibility, desire, and necessity. The main means of expression of the first type of modality is the category of inclination, the second type is the introductory (modal) words, and the third type is the category of cases (Shcherba) added to the cut (predicate). The first type of modality is a necessary sign of a sentence, and the other types of modality are optional signs of a sentence. Thus, the absence of a common denominator in the content plan of a modality undermines its internal integrity.

The most important thing in distinguishing the above types of modality is that little attention is paid to the subjective side. The same subjective party can act as a unifying symbol. R.Sibagatov is right that modality is, first of all, a reflection of the speaker's attitude to reality. In his view, modality as a unifying feature of the speaker's attitude to the content plan maintains the integrity of the category. Everyone agrees that modality is an expression of attitude. Relationships, on the other hand, require certain elements to be involved. The problem of interrelated elements in linguistics has not been clearly defined. That's why the relationship itself is still uncertain. When asked what the main character is, some say it's modality.

When it comes to modality and predicative, it is sometimes said that modality is a much broader concept than predicative, and sometimes modality is an integral part of predicative. V. Vinogradov equates modality with predicative. The correct constant and direct expression of the category of predicative is the modality of speech, "he said. N.E.Petrov says that in order to define a certain limit of modality and predicative, predicative should be considered as a unit of language level as a logical-syntactic category, and modality as a unit of speech level as a communicative-syntactic category. But this does not make their difference clear. Because one type of modality also applies to the language level.

In the semantic plan, subjectivity (the speaker's point of view), which acts as a unifying sign for the modality category, can act as a distinguishing sign between the predicative category and the modality category. First, modality is a broader concept than predicative. Because predicative is specific only to the level of speech, modality is also specific to non-modal devices (such as phrases). Therefore, modality considered at the speech level is an integral element of predicative. While predicative refers in general to the relation of information expressed through speech to objective reality, modality refers to the relation of the content of speech to the objective being from the speaker's point of view, or the relation of the speaker to the content of speech. In both types of modality, the sign of subjectivity has a separate place.

There are 12 modal verbs in English: can, may, must, should, ought, shall, will, would, need, dare, to be, to have (to have got). The last two modalities have the same meaning. The other 10 are defective or defective, meaning they do not have the properties of other verbs. That is:

They do not accept the 1st person singular suffix -s.
They don’t have a verb feature, so they don’t have an analytic form.
They (except for can and may) have only one form, no past tense.
They (except for can and may) have only one form, no past tense.
They are used (except ought) without loading the infinitive to.
They do not need auxiliary verbs to form interrogative and negative forms. All modal verbs have 2 types of negation, full and abbreviated forms. The full form may not be necessary and should not be needed. The abbreviated form mayn’t mustn’t wouldn’t shouldn’t needn’t

Some of them have special features in both pronunciation and spelling

Cannot, shall not will

Can’t [ka: nt] Shan’t [ʃaː nt] Won’t [woun’t]

There are two forms of this modal verb: -can for the present tense, and -could for the past tense and desire.

- I can’t dance now but I could when I was young.
- I wish I could go with you.

Physical or mental ability when the soul is expressed by an incomplete general infinitive. Ability is also expressed by "to be able to"

- Mary can speak English quite well but she can’t write it at all (can = to be able, to know how to ...).
- John can keep a secret if he wants to (can = to be able of).
- I can drive a car = I know how to ...
- I couldn’t understand him when he spoke very fast (= was unable to, was incapable of ...).
- He could (was able to) speak English very well when he was twelve.

We use "to be able to" in the sense of ability for the future tense, because the soul is not a form of the future tense.

- Soon he will be able to speak English quite fluently.

Can be used interchangeably with to be able if it expresses small abilities.

- I couldn’t / was not able to do that new job; it was too difficult.
- This man could / was able to cure all diseases.

But to be able to use other abilities to achieve something or to be able to do it. So to be able to Combined with the words "ability" and "success." In this case, "was able to" means "to succeed", "could", and could.

- The fire brigade was able (succeeded in putting, managed) to put out the fire before it destroyed the other buildings.
- I was able to go to the mountains yesterday as I had a day off (I could and went).
- I was able to finish my work in an hour (I managed, I could and did it).

Probability represents a situation:

- Anybody can make a mistake.
- Everyone can make mistakes.
- You can hardly blame him for that.

"It's not easy to blame him for that."

Probability also implies the emergence of rules:

- In old days a man could be sentenced to death for a small crime.
"In the past, people could have been sentenced to death for petty crimes."

✓ The Lower House alone can initiate financial measures.

"Only members of the lower house can push forward financial issues."

c) Thought probability (hence it is also called “theoretical” probability.)

✓ The railways can be improved. (Railways may be improved, they are not finished yet)

Probability is used in general statements as "sometimes": The sea can be rough. = The sea is sometimes rough.

Life means opportunity in interrogation and impossibility in statement.

✓ Can this be true? (the probability that this is true)

"Is that true?"

✓ This can’t be true. (Impossible to do so) Permission

✓ Can we go home, Miss?

"May we go home, ma'am?"

➢ Ne can go now.

"She can go now."

➢ The teacher said we could go home

"The teacher let us go home."

Can is now more common than may (or might) to express the idea permission. Prohibition (use of modal verbs in the form of negation. Prohibition is the denial of permission, ie not allowed)

➢ You can’t cross the street here.

"It's forbidden to cross the street from here."

➢ You can’t touch the exhibits in a museum (it is not allowed).

➢ Can we stay here? - No, I’m afraid you can’t. (It’s not allowed.)

5. Please.

✓ Can you hold on a minute, please?

✓ Can you hold me for 1 minute, please?

✓ Can I have some water?

"May I have some water?"

➢ Can you put the meat in salted water?

"Can you put the meat in salt water?"

Could represent a high level of politeness:

➢ Could you come again tomorrow?

"Can you come again tomorrow?"

In conclusion, the non-realistic modality refers to the idea of an event that does not exist in practice, but is intended to occur, intended, or may occur under certain conditions. Nonreality in the broadest sense indicates that the content of a sentence does not correspond to reality. From the above, it is clear that the first type (objective) modality is inextricably linked with predicative and is a distinguishing feature of a sentence, because it always applies to the whole sentence, that is, it does not exist outside the predicate. Objective modality is also a necessary feature of a sentence, because in each sentence the relation of the content of the sentence to reality is
expressed in terms of reality or unreality. Subjective modality refers to the attitude of the speaker to the objective content expressed in the sentence. The main means of expressing this type of modality are modal words. Modal words are often connected to a participle in a sentence and serve as a means of expressing general modality.

Subjective modality refers to the speaker's attitude to the reality of the content of the speech, that is, how he evaluates it. The speaker's assessment of the reality of a sentence depends on his or her awareness of the facts of the sentence.
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