Modal Words in Modal Function

Ashinova Kunipa Akhatovna[1], Murzagaliyeva Maral[2], Zalledinova Zhanna[3], Syzdykbayev Nurgali[4], Ashinov Rauan[5]

Abstract

Modality is strongly tied to problems about the unity of language and thought, as well as language's communicative role. Sentences with the word modality in Turkic languages is still understudied, and there are a lot of controversy and unanswered issues around modality. The sentence conveys not simply a message about something, but also the speaker's perspective on it. Consequently, every sentence comprises the modality. One of the most important aspects of the phrase is its modality. The linguistic characteristics of modality in the modern Kazakh language are extremely diverse and complicated in terms of structure and composition, because language is a system. However, it is not difficult to divide them into specific stable models and present them systematically in particular models. As a result, they cannot remain impartial in the absence of such consistency. Such language models that demonstrate this range of possibilities are widely distributed in our language. The language contains language pattern models that are actively used in relation to speech possibilities. It is difficult to count them without instantly leaving a list, because communicative and stylistic interests are evolving and expanding continually, like the language itself in general. The research aim. In this work, we made an attempt to analyze modal words, which, along with introductory words and particles, correspond to the lexical-syntactic means of conveying the modality of the sentence. Our research focused on the following questions: "What is the modality in general? What are its methods of expression? By what means are the modalities of sentences expressed in the Kazakh language? Achieving the intended purpose necessitated solving the objectives:
- to determine the meanings expressed by modal verbs;
- to analyze the grammatical features of modal verbs and their distinctive features;
- to identify the essence of modal relationship (how does the speaker understand the message; how does he describe it; how does he accept the truth);
- to reveal the means of expressing modality from the point of view of their semantic and universal features;
- to establish general and specific features and differences in the means of expressing modality.
The work uses general scientific and philological methods: observation, comparison, linguistic analysis of literary text, contextual analysis and component analysis. The methodological and theoretical basis of the study were the works examining certain problems of the texts and categories of modality, set out in the works of linguists such as Palmer (2001), Vinogradov (1975) in domestic and international schools of science. The research material consists of 2000 examples, which present materials from the press and fiction, including methods of conveying subjective modal assessment. The instances extracted from the texts were analyzed, and individual language

---

[1] Candidate of Philological Sciences (PhD), Kazakh National Women's Pedagogical University, Kazakhstan, Email: kunipa_almaty@mail.ru Orcid: 0000-0001-6938-2092
[2] Candidate of Philological Sciences (PhD), Kazakh National University Named After Al-Farabi, Almaty, Kazakhstan, Email: maral0903@mail.ru, Orcid: 0009-0004-3595-6229
[3] PhD, Kazakh National Women's Pedagogical University, Almaty, Kazakhstan, Email: zalledin_zhanna@mail.ru, Orcid: 0009-0004-0797-7647
[4] Candidate of Philological Sciences, Associate Professor, Kazakh University of International Relations and World Languages, Email: siznur@mail.ru, orcid: 0000-0002-8162-4792
[5] Master of the chair of 'Scenography', Kazakh National Academy of Arts, Kazakhstan, Email: killahpro.88@mail.ru orcid: 0009-0003-0616-3302

examples borrowed from theoretical and lexicographical sources were also subjected to linguistic analysis. The article's practical significance stems from the ability to use its materials and conclusion when giving grammar lectures, special translation practice courses, developing programs, educational and methodological aids, and furthering theoretical issues of modality in general. Theoretical significance provides the functional method to comprehending the meaningful character of modality. Findings. Modal words are classified into several parts of speech based on their grammatical and lexical features. They include both significant and service words. Based on real data, we found that the investigated words are distinguishable by semantic richness in expressing modal shades in the phrase. There are some modal words in Kazakh and other Turkic languages, due to the nature of their uses, however, they are extremely diverse and multifaceted, and as linguistic facts show, they can be used as synonyms in relation to one another. They also have diverse shapes. In addition to the primary meaning, they have numerous derivative meanings. Modal words that exist in a grammatical link are used in their nominative lexical meanings as independent constituents of the sentence, i.e. as a predicate; in modal meaning, they are used as one of the components of the complicated verb. The environment in which the meaning is born plays an important part in the creation of the grammatical semantics of modal verbs, and meanings within certain forms of modality are established on its foundation, including derived modal terms.

Keywords: *modal words, subjective modality, objective modality, grammaticalization, categories of actualization, lexical-grammatical meaning, differentiating modal terms, linguistic phenomenon.*

Introduction

Modality is a collection of actualization categories that, from the speaker's point of view, indicate how the propositional base of the concept being stated relates to reality in terms of its primary characteristics. According to modern studies, the fields of modality and temporality are at the heart of the group of predicative categories of all actualization (transforming the function in the potential aspect into the resulting function) that expresses the speaker's relationship to the truth in terms of utterance content. Modal words are intimately associated with the linguistic phenomena of modality and predicate. The broad relationship between the sentence's content and truth is known as the predicate. A modal relation exists between the truth and the message conveyed in the statement. The core of the modal relationship is how the speaker perceives the truth, how he describes his message, and how he interprets it. The predicate is a property of thought production by linguistic norms and formulation. Despite their tight relationship, they have considerable variances. Among the primary consistent elements of a sentence, modality typically consists of the speaker's other modal relations as well as their intonation, which establishes the message's rhythm and thoroughness. The predicate, on the other hand, makes sure that conversational units are grammatically ordered. If we think about predicate as a communicative-syntactic category at the level of modal speech and as a logical-syntactic category at the level of language, we may see a certain borderline of these two occurrences a little more clearly. Predicate is the linguistic phrase used to illustrate how the sentence's content relates to reality. Furthermore, the speaker's assessment of this relationship, or his perspective on it (his attitude to attitude) is explained in terms of linguistic modality. Since all things are immediately tied to language, regardless of the predicate's form, speaking acts are related to various modalities. Another area of linguistics that is currently unexplored is the modality, which is the relationship between the speaker's chosen truth and the notion that is stated (propositional basis).

Modal words in several Turkic languages (including Kazakh) are classified mostly as auxiliary terms. It establishes the speaking subject's attitude toward the correspondence between the

communicated idea and reality. Differentiating modal terms as a distinct lexical-semantic and grammatical category, how languages have developed is typically not consistent. For instance, in Russian, they are constructed and customized using a combination of basic and condensed sentences. Furthermore, they emerged as a separate auxiliary word class in the majority of Turkic languages in tandem with the swift advancement of written literary languages. The numerical volume of modal words is now varying because their nature has not yet been fully understood. The semantics of modal words and phrases are not substantive. Their grammatical interpretation of modality is entwined with its semantics. According to this perspective, moods and modal words are the same type of language phenomenon. Moods are also a morphological means by which the speaker can subjectively judge whether an action is true or false, i.e., convey sentence modality. In addition to being communicated by single words, mood and certain attached forms of the verb can also convey modality meanings like wish, prediction, obligation, and confidence. From the point of view of the lexical-grammatical meanings of words and modal words, they are linguistic phenomena of the same kind. The meeting of obligatory, possible, and tentative types of moods in modern Yakut and some other Turkic languages also proves this opinion, albeit indirectly.

The material for analysis and investigation consists of ten fiction novels written by Kazakh authors (Abai Kunanbaev, volumes I and II.; Kasym Amanjolov, volume I.; "Abai Zholy" (M. Auezov) Volume I and II; Millionaire (G. Mustafin); Kazakh soldier (G. Musrepov); Shyganak (G. Mustafin); Kyz Zhibek (epic). The study used 2000 examples derived from fiction, including methods of expressing modal judgment.

The article's content is organized as follows: introduction; research aim and questions; method; findings; discussion conclusion and recommendations.

Literature Review

Modality has been researched and summarized by many linguists (Dragomir, 2023), (Romero, 2019), (Vetter, 2021), (Correia & Skiles, 2021), (Clarke-Doane & McCarthy, 2022), (Eklund, 2023), and hypotheses on modality, its categories, and discourse meaning have been presented in the books "Modality in Under described Languages" (Methods and Insights) edited by J.V. Klok (2022), "Modality Across Syntactic Categories" edited by A. Arregui (2017).

According to Hacquard, he proposes relativizing the accessibility relation of a modal to an event rather than a world: the accessibility relation has a free event variable that must be bound locally, either by aspect, the speech event, or an embedding attitude verb (2006). Öhlschläger points out that modal verbs have a hierarchy of modality types based on their distance from autonomous lexical complete verbs. Epistemic modality has the strongest auxiliary tendency, while dynamic modality is more likely to participate in "lexical autonomy" (1989).

The mood and tense categories express the meaning of modality in modal verbs. According to this definition, V. Vinogradov (1975) states: "... the relationship of any statement or assumption to reality is called objective-subjective modality". T. Komova (1990) also characterizes modality relations as an objective-subjective shading in the evaluation of action.

Sodik (2011) points out that M. Kasymova (1976) also underlines the link between modality and mood: "Modal relations are intimately tied to the moods of the verbs. The moods of the verb enable to precisely comprehend the many shades of the meaning of modality". Based on these criteria, we can express the employment of modal verbs in moods as modality (modal verbs) in modality (mood), implying a subjective attitude.

Palmer (1990) states that people's usage of modal verbs is semantically subjective, revealing their personal beliefs or preconceptions. C.R. Whitehead (1991) feels that there are some inherent links in semantic consideration between certain moods and specific tenses and modalities, e.g. directives and requests must express events that are both future to the speech time and of the time/reality line, and future events in different languages can be marked as future tense, irrealis, or both; similarly, commands and requests can be expressed as future tense, irrealis, imperative mood, or any combination of the three.

H. Yu (2023) confirms that the concept of modality has been a topic of interest in various branches of linguistic studies; although scholars differ in the exact definition of modality, they generally share the idea that modality is a way to express the speaker's opinion and attitude, judgment and evaluation, for this reason, modality is considered part of the interpersonal meta-function of language in Systemic Functional Linguistics.

In addition to multiple definitions of modality, there are differing perspectives on its categorical membership. Modality is considered a grammatical category by Hacquard (2013), a syntactic category by A. Arregui (2017), and a semantic category by Jinghua Zhang (2019). The category of modality in linguistics remains controversial due to its multidimensional nature, as E. Zagrodskaya (2003) states: "Modality is one of the phenomena that, constantly eludes more or less clear definition, along with the indisputability of its existence in language". According to Sodik, (2011) modal verbs have the following common characteristics: they are modal in meaning, auxiliary in function, inadequate in form, and in the verb system they occupy an intermediate position between full-meaning (semantic) and auxiliary verbs.

Modal verbs have evolved from full-meaning verbs (lexemes) to auxiliary verbs (grammemes), demonstrating the potential to rethink their linguistic meanings. This suggests that modal verbs actively participate in grammaticalization, which is a universal fundamental process of language evolution. Furthermore, the intricacy of the modal relations expressed by modal verbs makes it impossible in some circumstances to distinguish between grammatical and lexical meanings. The proper use of modality would substantially support the pragmatic aspect of academic writing, assist scholars in accurately expressing their research findings (Yang, 2018), and also reflect an advanced level of both linguistic and pragmatic proficiency in the written mode (Ton, 2020).

Gueron (2008) proposes that the grammatical function of the modal verb is not to introduce a possible world in which the situation described is true, but rather to illustrate how that situation can be introduced into the actual world. He claims that grammar does devote a lot of space to exploring ways in which an envisaged situation can become a real situation, that is, to causality, and that modal sentences occupy a unique position within that grammatical space. Pieces of a grammatical system can replace each other [peuvent s'échanger] because of their shared function, even when their semantic and stylistic values are not identical. Compare the following "functional equivalents": the house my father owns, of which my father is the owner, belonging to my father, owned by my father, and finally, my father's house. (Bally, 2001). Bally developed the idea of utterances and stated that an utterance consists of two elements: the basic substance (dictum) and an individual appraisal of the facts provided (modus). He used them to distinguish the objective and subjective aspects of judgment. Bally's concept of the obligatory combination of objective and subjective elements of meaning in a statement is also presented in C. Fillmore's formula (1981): sentence = modality + proposition (Vasileyova, 2009).

The actualization of grammar is regarded by Bondarko (1990) as categories of grammar in the widest sense, encompassing both functional semantic categories and merely own categories.

The conventional interpretation of the term "actualization" is somewhat broadened by this description of actualization categories. The scientist states, "What we want to expand is to connect the concept of actualization with the symbol as well as with the whole utterance". The propositional basis is defined by researchers as "the relation of the content for the expressed thought to reality." Verbality is an objective modality that is unaffected by the context of the conversation. Now commonly recognized in linguistics, particularly in functional grammar, the "modal frame" is made up of the meanings connected to the speech subject's differing directional attitude toward the information mentioned in the proposition. When discussing multiple, subjective modalities, the final modal frame phrase is frequently employed. The objective and subjective types of modalities discussed correspond to the combinations of modal and lexical modality that are frequently found later, particularly in functional grammar.

The modality character can sometimes affect the probative base, whose content has already been modalized, e.g. Ali can read a book. Ali reads books with ease. Ali might be proficient in reading a book. Three tiers of the hierarchy of modal meanings are now mentioned in research on the relevant area. The greater general modal level is the first. Finding the modal semantics invariant is the issue at hand. Differentiating and contrasting distinct modal meaning kinds is the second step. The possibility, necessity, desirability, types, and variations of meanings are all multi-level variations of individual modal meanings that make up the third level. Semantic fields can be freely assigned to each modal category. The range of possibilities in the language is represented by the complexation of tools at different language levels, leading to the formation of model patterns and procedures that are not limited but excessively varied. Both their composition and structure are intricate. These modal modifiers are typically hard to locate and identify due to their intricacy. In the Kazakh language, in addition to purely modal words, there are individual words that have independent lexical meaning and modal meaning. In the Yakut language, in certain contexts, there are also "transitional" modal words outside of these two. Modal words are usually used in close connection with all ways of expressing modality, such as phonological (intonation), morphological (verb moods and their analytical forms), and syntactic (different types of sentences). Certain modal verbs are never modified; word-forming and word-changing affixes are not accepted. Modal words were divided into distinct word classes during the long-term lexical-grammatical development process, much like all other auxiliary word classes (this is an ongoing process).

The subordinate phrase, which has lost its substantive meaning and predicate role in the discussion, likewise uses modal terms from the narrator. With the emergence of those modal terms also came the appearance of modal phrases. The reduction (reduction) of conditional subordinate clauses frequently results in modal phrases. Additionally, it is created by cutting down on conjunctive and storable ("insertion") clauses. Similarly, the words 'alpeti' in the Kazakh language can be said to have come from the reduction of the prepositional phrase "soz alpetine karaganda" (in regard to his words). As a result, the formation and development of various forms of grammatical and modal meanings should be viewed from an evolutionary perspective, because language's ability to communicate is what gives rise to the modality. This leads to the appearance of various modalities in morphology. With a more abstract and all-encompassing modal meaning, the mood category is the most significant and prominent kind among them.

The category with the most grammaticalization is verb moods. Thus, from phonetics to syntax, all levels of grammar influence linguistic modality. In general, one of the most distinguishing features of the grammatical structure of nascent written languages is the development of

mechanisms of conveying modality. Because of this, modality was seen by Vinogradov (1975) as one of the syntactic categories that expressed and clarified predictiveness in a wide grammatical meaning. In other words, he stressed that the modality, tense, and mood categories are established from the speaker's perspective in a given sentence and defined them as categories that express and specify predictiveness. Predictiveness manifests itself more directly and steadily in sentence modality (Bondarko, 1990). Objective modality is commonly related to the notion of predictability. Because this, like objective modality, depends on how the sentence's content relates to reality in terms of truth. Predicative modality can be broadly classified into two categories: necessity modality and possibility modality. Predicativeness is a semantic area that includes both. Grammatical (modal terms and their equivalents), morphological (verb tenses), and syntactic (analytical) forms are used to represent the potentiality lexicon. As a rule, numerous language tools, such as lexical, morphological, and syntactic tools, developed within the framework of the aforementioned levels, are connected in studies "from semantics to form," that is, in functional grammar, they become "unified." This "unification" and "one-way semanticization" of language tools at various levels are reliant on each other for common meaning. For instance, special modal verbs and predicative nouns, open and conditional mood forms of attributive-temporal meaning, and infinitive constructions constantly complement and blend closely with each other, demonstrating this clearly in the language tools that express feature modality among them. Integrative grammar, one facet of the aforementioned "semantics-to-form" research, typically stems from its intricate nature.

In Arabic, modality may be expressed either by an impersonal structure «it is necessary that S", as in French or English, or by an invariable particle that governs an imperfective lexical verb. In the Romance languages, where modal verbs do agree in person with their subjects, morphological agreement is not necessarily referential. In French, the same morpheme is used both for referential human and non-referential or -human third-person pronouns. English must distinguish these cases (Gueron, 2008).

In Turkish, it is possible to have two modal suffixes in the same word, with the epistemic further from the root than the root modal (Yükseker, 1989), as expected given the Mirror Principle (Baker, 1985). In the root ability modal –abil, appears closer to the root than the epistemic suffix, -meli. These examples provide some further evidence for two functional positions for modality, one low for root modals and one high for epistemic modals. Oku-y-abil-ecek-ti-m read-epenthetic 'y'-MOD 'able'-fut-past-1sg 'I was going to be able to read/ I would be able to read' b. Oku-y-abil-meli-y-di-m read-epenthetic 'y'-MOD 'able'-MOD'must'-copular-past-1sg 'I should have been able to read' (Cournane, 2015).

Modal particles in Dutch and German facilitate epistemic readings of modal verbs. Examples from Dutch show that in a modal sentence without the modal particle 'wel', the modal verb 'moeten' is interpreted as a root modal (especially out of the blue), while the addition of wel facilitates epistemic reading. The English cognate well reinforces epistemic readings of could or might, rather than prompting an epistemic interpretation. Hij moet thuis zijn He must at-home be-INF "Out of the blue" reading: 'He is obliged to be at home'. Hij moet wel thuis zijn. He must be well at home be-INF. "Out of the blue" reading: 'It is highly likely that he is at home' (Cournane, 2015).

The novel forms of volitive shall in the fiction domain are reasonable because fiction allows writers to use various language elements (Sanger, 2003). The researchers found out that the usage of shall could be classified as rules and regulations, direction, permission, prediction, and

volition. The most significant difference shall between academic and fiction registers is in rules and regulations. In the academic domain, shall occurred 65 times, but there was no occurrence of shall in the fiction domain. This could be true because both registers were domains with different content (Samodra, 2022).

The domain of dynamic possibility is dominated by can and could, that of epistemic possibility by may and might. In the latter case, the traditional supremacy of may is being threatened by might, especially in American and Australian usage; could emerge as an exponent of the same meaning; and instances of can that are not restricted to non-affirmative contexts are beginning to appear (Collins, 2007). According to some researchers targeted construction storyboards are an important tool in semantic fieldwork, and they advocate for its use in research on modality in particular (Kolagar, 2022).

Discussion

Only grammatical means of expressing modality such as affixes, auxiliaries, syntactic structures, etc. should be used as a foundation since modality is understood as a form of grammatical meaning. In speech, some particular words (adverbs, each side, etc.) take on a modal value that becomes fixed in those words. Modal words are composed not only of individual words but also of complex compound terms. Modal words are a rich way to convey linguistic modality as an auxiliary word class and are made up of various grammaticalized phrases with modal meanings. The lexical semantics of individual words should not be confused with the general category meaning of word classes. Since the primary indicator (primary sign) is used to differentiate word classes from one another, establishing the boundary and distance, is the broad category meaning. Modal words are currently categorized as auxiliary word classes in various languages, and their basic categorical meaning, i.e., the speaker's attitude toward the message conveyed in the sentence, is considered the foundation and standard. Generally speaking, the categorical meaning of any word class should come first when identifying and individualizing it.

The issue of grammaticalizing completely meaningful independent words is intimately linked to the study of auxiliary words. Words can only be a specific lexical means of expressing grammatical (modal) meaning if their modal semantics are distinct from their material (nominative) meaning. Only these words make up the word class known as modal words. Thus, as individual words with complete meanings gradually become grammaticalized, modal words emerge. Consequently, one of the main issues with language theory is this grammaticalization process. The only meaning that pure modal words have is modal, or grammaticalized. As a result, modal words typically only form part of the lexical-grammatical category as an auxiliary word class.

Modal words are distinguished from substantive words based on how they are separated from their substantive content. This includes completely meaningful standalone words in their forms as well as words and phrases used as parts of sentences. In this sense, one of the primary processes leading to the formation (appearance) of modal words is the phenomena of syntactic compression, also known as "Syntaxic input". Various other language grammars are also vulnerable to this process of defining modal word groups. This widely recognized theoretical idea forms the basis of the issue with viewing the occurrence of syntactic compression as the primary factor in the formation of a group of modal words. "Standard syntactic forms are morphological forms. Nothing in morphology was absent from syntax and vocabulary before

it. The evolution of syntactic breeds into morphological ones and the mingling of syntactic borders are the histories of morphological elements and categories (Vinogradov, 1975).

Modal words have "perceptible lexicality" in their semantics, indicating that they have nominative meaning and are hence evident. As with other auxiliary terms, their dictionary definition precisely matches their grammatical meaning, or more accurately, their meaning at the grammatical level is the modal meaning. Furthermore, the major function of modal words' lexical-grammatical meaning is to ascertain the speaker's stance toward the interplay between reality and truth. A lot of modal expressions also lack a clear object meaning. Their semantics and that modality's grammatical meaning are closely related. From the perspective of what is being said, modal words are auxiliary words that originate as descriptive nouns, verbs, and adverbs, do not undergo personal transformation, and convey the speaker's relationship to reality. In terms of their "collective" ("generalized") lexical-grammatical meaning, modal words are often comparable to verb tenses. As a result, in speech, these two modalities of expression are tightly related. In the Kazakh language, certain modal terms are employed in place of prepositional phrases. They shouldn't be treated the same as acronyms because of that. They belong to two different categories. Auxiliary words constitute a class because modal words are a morphological category. Furthermore, short words belong to the syntactic category. These are not subject to grammaticalization. Auxiliaries or independent words with a full meaning are used as part of a sentence. The unique syntactic characteristic of modal words is that, even when they exist as a distinct lexeme in a dialogue, they fulfill the role of an entire sentence in terms of outward form, pronunciation, and intonation on their own. These syntactical types of modal words do not form regular grammatical connections with the sentence's constituent components, nor do they contribute to the formation of phrases. Modal words are employed in dialogic speech as a word in sentence form, as an isolated portion of the sentence, and as auxiliary members that lend modal tone to the meaning of a single sentence element or the content of the complete sentence in Kazakh language.

The long-term lexical-grammatical development of completely meaningful independent word classes produces modal words, much as other auxiliary word classes. During the process, it became detached from its initial meaning, eventually drifting away from them. Certain lexical devices in the phrase were permanently subordinated, which resulted in the establishment of modal words. Depending on where it is in the phrase or sentence hierarchy, a word or phrase will eventually become a modal word or modal phrase by gradually severing from its material or other conceptual meaning and the typical syntactic relationship with the other sentence elements. Certain modal words and phrases have been "fixed" in a certain morphological form over a lengthy period. As a result, it is only utilized in a modal meaning in our language and is permanently isolated from the other word classes and phrase types that are now in use. Furthermore, the relationship that some of them formerly had with specific word classes and phrases is now only maintained in a formal sense. They contain both the meaning of modal words and modal phrases, depending on the context.

Some researchers categorize modal words into four groups based on the genetic principle, taking into account the unique origin of the linguistic phenomenon mentioned. These groups include words that are completely separated from other word classes, noun modal words, adverb modal words, and verb modal words. Modal words in the modern Turkish literary language are divided into three categories: words expressing different semantic tones of word meanings in speech; words that bring into speech modal and volitional tones and words that perform form-building functions (Ashinova, 2020).

Modal words do not have specific substantive or conceptual semantics. Their semantics is typically connected to the modality's grammatical meaning. For this reason, they are auxiliary terms. A process of grammatical structure development that began in the early stages of human language formation and is somewhat ongoing to this day is the production (appearance) of general auxiliary terms. This one is almost like a verbatim archaism. The earliest known grammatical phenomenon is modalities, which are thought to be the "prolongation" of interpersonal interactions and mutual communication through language participation. Modality continues to be the most productive source of inspiration for the evolution of language as a whole. The following specific ways of creating modal words and phrases are predominant in some modern Turkic languages, according to an overview and analysis of various theoretical concepts and scientific viewpoints from the research works in modern linguistic science related to the problem of language modality.

1. The lexemes of pure modal and noun modal words, as well as modal phrases, have developed typical stability and are fairly stable in the dependent form. With isaphetic phrases, these have passed into the group of modal terms. The key determinant in the establishment and evolution of their modal word group is, in essence, the abstractness of the material meaning and the convenience of the third-person subjunctive link in individual lexemes. When creating modal terms in Kazakh and certain other Turkic languages, this is a more effective method.
2. The appearance of modal words results from some nouns and adverbs that lose their modifier function and substantive meaning when used in an adverbial sense. We can observe that, for instance, from the following comparisons.
3. Sometimes the narrator of a subordinate clause loses its predicate function, forming modal words.
4. In some circumstances, a modal phrase can even be constructed by removing one of its components to create a modal word. By contrasting these one or two instances, the following concept emerges: What lies below the surface can be known by seven levels (Musrepov). Perhaps on the day of his arrival, the governor will order you to keep quiet (Mustafin).
5. Words with modalities, such as "like" and "appear" come from roots that denote "face, image, shape, form, type."
6. Words like perhaps, certainly, necessary, likely, and perhaps have been borrowed from Arabic and Persian into our language.

The lexeme of 'gerik', which is regarded as a modal word in any of the modern Turkic languages, including Kazakh, is employed in the ancient Turkic monuments with an entirely different meaning than the now recognized meaning of 'gerik' (necessary). The following information, for instance, makes this quite evident: My brother Kyl-Tegin was кʌrgʌк. 'Кʌrgʌк' - necessary; кʌrgʌкlik - necessary; кʌrgʌк - end (death, necessity, fate); кʌrgʌкsiz - without end, without boundaries, without grief (without necessity); кʌrgʌt - limit; кʌrgʌк – end; кʌrgʌкsiz - immensely. Here is 'kdrgdk' in the meaning "necessary" and 'kdrgdk' in the concept of 'the end, the last' (death, necessity, fate). Although there is a significant difference in meaning between them, it seems that both of them may be the same phenomenon from the genetic point of view. Because in Turkology it is organized as follows in terms of morphological structure: 'ker' is 'necessary'. Some researchers explain the etymology of this lexeme differently. "Necessary, apparently, from 'ker' – 'will be satisfied'. Comparison: кʌр кер 'summon the soul'. Perhaps, the meaning of the word 'to die and go to the other world' is related to the meaning of 'being needed by God'. (Janpeiisov, 1958).

Modal words can be formed in a variety of ways in Turkic languages. These lines have a close relationship to the morphological shape and structure of modal words. Nonetheless, the issues surrounding the etymology of the modal word group and its genesis are often significant and difficult subjects that need specialized historical and comparative research. However, it may be claimed that the derivation of certain modal words based on nouns and verbs is evident. This is because they haven't broken their ties to their origins, or their fully functional separate lexemes, yet. Furthermore, figuring out the etymological makeup of modal sentences is not hard. Only thorough scientific analysis, historical investigation, and comparative study will be able to reveal the morphological and structural nature of lexemes in this sector.

The modal word group in the Turkic languages of Central Asia has distinct features from other Turkic languages. This is because several modal words from Arabic-Iranian languages are currently borrowed in the languages of this group. However, this does not imply that the regional languages lack original modal words. Furthermore, it might be stated in the language of the Siberian Turkic peoples that terms of this type are uncommon in general. Many of the things that go on around us, different ways of living, criticism, and actions of particular objects, are generally too complex to be captured in a single line or sent simply through the basic message form. Typically, the speaker's opinion of this message is included, as well as whether the sentence's substance adequately depicts reality.

In linguistics, there are two general ways to assess a sentence's modality: objective modality and subjective modality. For instance, objective modality is the agreement between the substance of the phrase above and truth. The generic predicate category level, or the wide problem of sentence predicate, is linked to the objective modality. Subjective modality is the speaker's perspective on how the sentence's content relates to the truth (correspondence); objective modality is typically communicated by mood forms, whereas subjective modality is mostly expressed by unique individual words. In most circumstances, there is a close relationship between the sentence's modality and a variety of additional meanings, particularly expressive and emotional ones. Consequently, there is both an expressive and emotional meaning in addition to the simply modal meaning. Even now, opinions regarding the quantity of modal words and their general composition vary. This is most likely because it is impossible to separate the two types of modalities described above, as well as pure modal meaning from expressive, emotional meanings.

Sentence modality is typically conveyed in multiple ways. The modality of the sentence category is expressed morphologically by the verb's mood, which also includes tense categories. Tense and tense are recognized as common verb types. Furthermore, it appears in sentences devoid of modal verbs. Typical sentence forms also convey modal tone. Sentence modality is expressed in this syntactic manner. Furthermore, obvious indications of the modal tone come from singulars, conjunctions, and particularly any interrogative clauses. However, not all words that give a phrase modal tone, such as adverbs and adjectives, are modal terms. This is so because unique words that indicate the speaker's view about how the sentence's content relates to truth have a clearer modal character than these. That's why they are referred to as modal terms. These unique modal words have a distinct composition from other modal words because they convey the speaker's viewpoint regarding the sentence's content.

Moderate words can belong to different word groupings such as verbs, nouns, auxiliary words, and others based on their lexical-grammatical characteristics. In terms of their grammatical purpose and sentence structure, words like 'maybe, obviously, true, of course, thing, look, like' and a few more are superlative. Additionally, these words are modal from the perspective of

semantic specificity, meaning, or what is the speaker's viewpoint regarding the message expressed in the sentence whether he accepts, suspects, guesses, or expresses solid certainty about it. The reason for this is that modal words, which convey the speaker's doubts about the sentence's meaning that is their approbation, desire, belief, or other comparable opinions are frequently found in linguistic literature. Thus, from a morphological perspective, the basis for treating modal words as distinct word classes is their semantic sign, which is the grammaticalization of words; secondly, the lack of a transformation system; and thirdly, their syntactic nature, which is the speaker's capacity to convey his attitude toward thought. According to the aforementioned, the modern Kazakh language contains the following lexemes that belong to this group of modal words 'as if', etc.

In the modern Kazakh language, modal terms are scarce. Just a little over sixty of them are phonetic variants, single sentences, and have a dialectic quality. However, based on their semantic characteristics, even these can be categorized into several groups: approximate meaning modal words, mandatory meaning modal words, modal words spoken based on someone else's words or information, addition (confirmation) modal words, meaningful modal words expressing desire (wish), and modal words expressing the concept of doubt (suspect). One of the most distinguishing elements of the Kazakh language's usage of modal words is that, while the majority of them are now used in various modal meanings, they have not yet totally divorced from their original literal meaning. Nowadays, the majority of them serve as both a fundamental lexical notion and a solid linguistic unit that conveys the speaker's attitude toward the sentence's content. It is evident from this particular comparison data set. Some lexemes are used in our language both modally and in their original lexical meaning. In our opinion, there is one reason for this: the process of grammaticalization is ongoing, more precisely, the problem of modality lies in the connection with the pragmatic side of the language in general, that is, its "practical life" (speech).

Modal words in the Kazakh language can be divided into three groups depending on their usage. They are:

1. Modal words that are used only in the function of syntactic conjunctions in the sentence: appearance, intention, really, in fact, in essence, indeed, of course, perhaps, etc. These are modal words that refer to the content of a whole sentence.
2. Modal words that are not related to the content of the entire sentence, but are always used only as auxiliary members in the narration of the narrator: should be, possible; necessary, maybe, etc. In the Kazakh language 'like' has a modal approximate meaning when the verb is used as an auxiliary part of the narrator's voice.
3. 'Maybe' (construction denoting doubtful modality). This modal word with approximate meaning is used in a sentence in the Kazakh language both in the position of a syntactically affixed participle and in the auxiliary function of the verb-noun narrator. At the same time, sometimes it is separated from the last possible part of the modal construction and is used at the beginning of the sentence, in the function of a syntactic clause, and the sentence ends with the verb that is attached to it: Maybe they are not at home; Maybe the governor will tell you not to make noise on the day he arrives. The word modal 'maybe' is sometimes used as a determining member, and the new noun takes on meaning. In this situation, no modal meaning is observed, for example: to believe is not possible.

The sentence makes extensive use of modal language. Sentence modality is one of the language's primary fundamental categories. First of all, it is stated in the clearest possible way and in a range of shades using the intonation method. All of the meaning and tone that are

expressed by the synthetic and analytical forms of the verb tenses likewise convey modalities. It can also be stated by combining the infinitive with the verb, noun, or modal-adjunctive portions of the sentence. To put it briefly, modality is an entire "class" of grammatical meanings that appear at various language and speech levels. There is a trend in linguistics to categorize modality as subjective or objective. The verb's mood forms have a more prominent role in conveying the objective mode. This is a result of the verb tenses becoming more grammaticalized, a phenomenon that is more akin to the language's word change formats. Subjective modality, however, is not. Auxiliaries are primarily responsible for expressing this final modality. As a result, the objective modality expresses how the communication relates to the truth, whereas the subjective modality expresses how the speaker relates to the message. Some examples of this are: Over there, winter falls early (objective modality); Winter seems to come early there (submodality). Modal verbs apply derived grammatical semantics and so serve as grammatical precedent units.

Conclusion

In Kazakh language nominal modal phrases are used to express obligations, assumptions, probability, categorical statements, and confirmation (recognition or agreement). Modal verbs communicate a variety of features of modality, including belief, uncertainty, reference to other people's words, desire (request), regret, assumptions, and so on. Sometimes, to differentiate one or another shade of modality, it is required to take into account the role of context. The grammaticalization of words is also highly important in the process of building and refining national speech culture. Our research has revealed that the spectrum of modal terms in modern language is expanding, owing mostly to the grammaticalization of words, both verbal and nominal. Individual words' usage varies based on the syntactic environment, i.e., they gradually appear in additional meanings similar to the meanings of introduction words, moods, and aspect.

The general ways of formation of modal words and the mechanism of creation of any of them indicate that modal words are auxiliary lexemes that appeared in the process of gradual development and maturation of the technique of communication in the oral (speaking) form of grammar. This conclusion, which comes from the analysis and collection of real language materials, can be concluded from the data of any language in general. It has a fundamental value not only in recognizing the nature of modal words but also in solving the problem of linguistic modality as a whole. The broad methods in which modal words are formed, as well as the mechanism by which they are created, show that modal words are auxiliary lexemes that emerged during the progressive growth and maturation of the technique of communication in the oral (speaking) form of grammar. This conclusion, which is based on the examination and gathering of authentic linguistic resources, can be drawn from data about any language in general. It is essential for understanding the nature of modal words as well as for resolving the issue of linguistic modality in general. A modal word, for instance, is an auxiliary word with a completely grammatical meaning if it is created through the grammaticalization of a fully meaningful independent lexeme. Therefore, modal words can only be an auxiliary word class, even if they evolve to the level of a distinct word class in any language. This emphasizes the crucial idea that, in addition to different forms of grammatical content, modality is a complex grammatical phenomenon articulated by entire word classes. What has been said raises one argument against the viability of viewing modality as a distinct class of grammatical meanings in its entirety.

Finding out as much as possible about the lexical, grammatical, and modal word origins and development processes is one of the most crucial prerequisites for understanding the modal phenomena in general, and in particular the similarities, relationships, and differences between lexical, grammatical, and modal meanings. Additionally, etymological research is somewhat necessary to solve the challenge of defining their free, morphological structure. Some of the words that we refer to as modal in Kazakh are imported phenomena, terms of foreign origin, or words that were transferred from other word classes during the language's development.

References

Arregui, A. (2017). "Modality Across Syntactic Categories". Oxford Academic Books, 2017, pp. 1-8.

Ashinova, K. (2020). Problems of Modality in Turkic and Kazakh Languages. Media Watch 11 (4), p.5, e-ISSN 2249-8818 DOI: 10.15655/mw/2020/v11i4/204631

Baker, M. (1985). The Mirror Principle and Morphosyntactic Explanation. Linguistic. Inquiry. Vol. 16, P.373-415.

Bally, C. (2001). General linguistics and issues of the French language. 2nd edition, stereotypical. Moscow: Editorial URSS, 416 p.

Bondarko, A.V. (1990), The theory of functional grammar. Temporality. Modality. Leningrad: Nauka, 1990. P. 62-65. ISBN 5-02-028005-4.

Clarke-Doane, J. & McCarthy, W. (2022). Modal Pluralism and Higher-Order Logic. Philosophical Perspectives 36 (1):31-58.

Collins, P. (2007). Can/could and may/might in British, American and Australian English: A corpus-based account // World Englishes. Vol. 26. Issue 4. P. 474-491.

Correia, F. & Skiles, A. (2021). Essence, Modality, and Identity. Mind 131 (524):1279-1302.

Cournane, Ailís (2015). Modal Development: Input-Divergent L1 Acquisition in the Direction of Diachronic Reanalysis. Thesis (PhD), Department of Linguistics University of Toronto, P.30.

Diver, W. (1964). The modal system of the English verb. World, Vol. 20, N3, P. 322-352.

Dragomir, A. (2023). Ideal Conceivers, the Nature of Modality and the Response-Dependent Account of Modal Concepts. Philosophia 51 (2):659-674.

Eklund, M. (2023). Thomasson on Modal Language. In Miguel Garcia-Godinez (ed.), Thomasson on Ontology. Palgrave MacMillan. pp. 137-161.

Ehrman, M. (1966). The meaning of the modals in present-day American English. The Hague; Paris, 106 p.

Fillmore, C. (1981). The matter in case. New in foreign linguistics. Issue X. Linguistic semantics. Moscow: Progress, p. 369–495.

Gueron, J. (2008). On the Temporal Function of Modal Verbs // Time and Modality / J. Gueron,

J. Lecarme (eds). Springer, P. 8-9.

Hacquard, V. (2013). The grammatical category of modality (Aspects of Modality). Thesis (PhD), Massachusetts Institute of Technology. 214 p. http://hdl.handle.net/1721.1/37421

Janpeiisov, E. (1958). Modal words in the modern Kazakh language. Moscow, P. 71.

Johansson, N. L. (1972). The English modal auxiliaries. Stockholm, 165 p.

Kiefer, F. 1994. Modality // The Encyclopedia of Language and Linguistics. Vol. 5 -Oxford, P. 2515 - 2516.

Klok, J., Rech, N.F., Guesser, S. (2022). Volume 357 in the series Trends in Linguistics. Studies and Monographs [TiLSM]. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110721478.

Kolagar, Z., Klok, J. (2022). Studying modality through targeted construction storyboards. https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110721478-003.

Komova, T. A. (1990). Modal verb in language and speech. M.: Moscow University Publishing House, 142p.

Öhlscläger, G. (1989). Zur Syntax und Semantik der Modalverben des Deutshcen, Max Niemeyer Verlag, Tübingen, P.50.

Palmer, F.R. (2001). Mood and Modality. Cambridge: University Press, 236 p.; Modality and the English Modals. London and New York: Longman.

Romero, C. (2019). Modality is Not Explainable by Essence. Philosophical Quarterly 69 (274):121-141.

Samodra, M.C., Bram, B. (2022). Modal Verb "Shall" in Contemporary American English: A Corpus-Based Study. Respectus Philologicus eISSN 2335-2388, no. 41 (46), P. 80.

Sodik, I.E. (2011). Grammatical features of constructions with modal verbs in the Tajik and English languages. Dissertation, PhD, 27p.

Ton, Nu. (2020). A study on modality in english-medium research articles. VNU Journal of Foreign Studies, Vol.36, No.6, 74-92.

Traugott, E. (1995). Subjectification in grammaticalization. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p.31-54.

Vetter, B. (2021). Essence, Potentiality, and Modality. Mind 130 (519):833-861.

Vinogradov, V.V. (1975). On the category of modality and modal words in Russian. Academy of Sciences of the USSR, V. II, p. 41. M., 775p.

Whitehead, C.R. (1991). Tense, aspect, mood and modality. P. 251. https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au › PL-A...

Yang, X. (2018). A corpus-based study of modal verbs in Chinese learners' academic writing. English Language Teaching, 11(2), 122-130.

Yu, H., Wang, N. (2023). What happened to the modal expressions? Modality in translating Chinese texts into English. Lingua. Volume 294, October, 103606.

Yükseker, H. (1989). What should deverbal affixes know: evidence from Turkish. Toronto Working Papers in Linguistics. University of Toronto, January, Volume 10.

Zagrodskaya, E.A. (2003). The modal meaning of necessity and the means of its expression. Ph.D. dissert. abstract, Novgorod, P. 12.

Zhang, J. (2019). A Semantic Approach to the English Modality. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, Vol. 10, No. 4, pp. 879-885.