O'ZBEKISTON RESPUBLIKASI OLIY VA O'RTA MAXSUS TA'LIM VAZIRLIGI

BUXORO DAVLAT UNIVERSITETI

INGLIZ TILI VA ADABIYOTI   KAFEDRASI

TALABA: Sevinchova Nilufar

KURS   ISHI

Mavzu: General characteristics of modal verbs

Tekshirdi :   **Saidova M.U.**

BUXORO - 2016

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

There is a big difference between understanding the grammar of a language and being able to speak that language well. You don't need to understand how a car engine works in order to drive a car. And you don't need to understand grammar to speak a language. Knowing grammar will, however, give you more confidence to speak, as you will be less afraid of making mistakes. Almost every grammar rule has an exception, so that the best way to improve your English is to practice as much as you can.

When English speakers begin to learn other languages they often find themselves being taught methods that assume they have a basic knowledge of English grammar.

Every attempt has been made to make the study of grammar appealing and interesting to young students the grammar has been introduced is a beautiful, synthesis of the traditional grammar and the modern structural approach. Such a happy blend will surely enable pupils to learn all the language skills in a proper way.

The rules of grammar for a language learner are like the rules of the road for a driver. In order to be able to drive properly and man ever with other drivers you have to know the rules that everyone goes by. Naturally, some people break the rules and make driving difficult for other drivers. This true of language too. If you follow the rules of grammar, you can express yourself clearly. But if you fail to observe those rules, people may find it difficult to understand you or they may even misunderstand you entirely. So it is really very important to understand and use correct grammar.

But what is grammar? Funk and Wagnall's New College Standard Dictionary describes grammar as <a type of science that explains the various principles of oral or written usage of a particular language>. It is also said to be "the developed art of speaking or written accurately in a particular language"

whether science or art, grammar is made up of the descriptions that tell you how to use a language correctly.

English grammar is not necessarily a chore. Indeed, it can be your key to unlocking a very rich treasure. Because skill in speaking and writing is the hallmark of all educated people. In oral language we use some verbs in order to show our ability, permission, prediction, advice and others. And this time modals help describe them.

The actuality of theme. The theme of my course paper is "Modal verbs and their functions in the English language". While examining this theme, we faced not only many different problems in finding exact materials related to this theme but also lots of new information, as a specific role and their characteristics of modal auxiliary verbs in Modern English, how it used to be and how it is used in our speech, nowadays.

The actuality of this theme is that modal verbs, known as "helping verbs" also, form one of the basic foundations of English grammar. We want to draw your attention to our theme, since it still needs further investigation on it; we tried our best to give the gist of this theme.

The object matter of the paper is modal auxiliary verbs and their characteristic features in the English language.

The aim and tasks of the paper. To study the functions of modal verbs in the English language is the aim of the work. According to this aim the following tasks have been put forward:
- To study characteristic features of the modal verbs in the English language
- To study primary and secondary functions of modal verbs
- To study the usage of modal verbs in expressing obligation and necessity
- To study principle modal verbs and their definition

The theoretical and practical value of the course work is that it can be used at the lessons as "Communicative grammar". Besides, the students of English department can use materials of this work for their presentations on subject "Modal auxiliary verbs"

The basic source of the paper. Azar B.S "Understanding and using English grammar", Palmer F.R. "Mood and Modality", Anthony W.R. "English Auxiliaries"

The structure of the course paper. This course paper consists of introduction, four paragraphs, conclusion and list of literature.

1. General characteristics of modal verbs.

Verbs like **can** and **may** are called modal verbs. We use modals, when we are concerned with our relationship with someone else. We may ask for permission to do something, give or receive advice, make or respond to requests and offers. We can express different levels of politeness both by the forms we choose and the way we say things. Using modals in oral language is more kindly and persuasive than the most complicated utterance. And they can be used for various different purposes. Modal verbs are not used independently in the English language; they follow main verbs to give extra sense. Modal verbs generally express speakers' attitudes. Each modal has more than one meaning or use. Modal verbs are called defective because all of them (except dare and need) lack verbal and analytical forms (i. e. compound tenses, analytical of subjunctive mood, the passive voice). They are verbs because they can combine with a subject:

a) They can sing

b) He may arrive tomorrow

c) I must have lost my presence of mind

d) The children can sing

e) James may arrive tomorrow

The modals *can* and *could* Old English can(n) and cuþ, which were respectively present and preterit forms of the verb cunnan ("to be able"). The silent in the spelling of could results from analogy with would and should.[1]

Similarly, *may* and *might* are from Old English mæg and meahte, respectively present and preterit forms of magan ("may, to be able"); *shall* and *should* are from sceal and sceolde, respectively present and preterit forms of sculan ("to owe, be

---

[1] Palmer, F. R., Mood and Modality, Cambridge Univ. Press, second edition, 2001, p. 33.

obliged"); and *will* and *would* are from wille and wolde, respectively present and preterit forms of willan ("to wish, want").

The aforementioned Old English verbs cunnan, magan, sculan and willan followed the preterit-present paradigm (or in the case of willan, a similar but irregular paradigm), which explains the absence of the ending -s in the third person on the present forms can, may, shall and will. (The original Old English forms given above were first and third person singular forms; their descendant forms became generalized to all persons and numbers.)

The verb must comes from Old English moste, part of the verb motan ("to be able to, be obliged to"). This was another preterit-present verb, of which moste the preterite was in fact (the present form mot gave rise to mote, which was used as a modal verb in Early Modern English; but must has now lost its past connotations and has replaced mote). Similarly, ought was originally a past form – it derives from ahte, preterit of agan ("to own"), another Old English preterit-present verb, whose present tense form ah has given the modern (regular) verb owe (and ought was formerly used as a past tense of owe).

The verb dare also originates from a preterit-present verb, durran ("to dare"), specifically its present tense dear(r), although in its non-modal uses in Modern English it is conjugated regularly.[2] However, need comes from the regular Old English verb neodian (meaning "to be necessary") – the alternative third person form need (in place of needs), which has become the norm in modal uses, became common in the 16th century.

A modal verb serves as an auxiliary to another verb, which appears in infinitive form (the bare infinitive, or the to-infinitive in the cases of ought and used as discussed above). Examples: You must escape; this may be difficult.[3]

---

[2] A Linguistic Study of the English Verb, Longmans, 1965, p. 46.

[3] Warner, Anthony R., English Auxiliaries, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993, p.58.

The verb governed by the modal may be another auxiliary (necessarily one that can appear in infinitive form – this includes be and have, but not another modal, except in the non-standard cases described below under Double modals). Hence a modal may introduce a chain (technically catena) of verb forms, in which the other auxiliaries express properties such as aspect and voice, as in He must have been given a new job.

Modals can appear in tag questions and other elliptical sentences without the governed verb being expressed: ...can he?; I mustn't.; Would they?

Like other auxiliaries, modal verbs are negated by the addition of the word not after them. (The modification of meaning may not always correspond to simple negation, as in the case of must not.) The modal can combines with not to form the single word cannot. Most of the modals have contracted negated forms in n't which are commonly used in informal

English: can't, mustn't, won't (from will), etc.

Again like other auxiliaries, modal verbs undergo inversion with their subject, in forming questions and in the other cases described in the article on subject–auxiliary inversion: Could you do this?; On no account may you enter. When there is negation, the contraction with not may undergo inversion as an auxiliary in its own right: Why can't I come in? (or: Why can I not come in?).

Modals verbs have a maximum of two forms; a base form and a irregular d-form. **Might** is the d-form of may; **could** is the d-form of can; **would** is the d-form of will; and **should** is the d-form of shall. But must, ought to and need have no d-forms, and none of the modal verbs have s-forms or ing-forms (mays, musting).

There are many kinds of modals:

Can-could

May-might

Will-would

Shall-should

Must

8

Ought to

They share the same grammatical characteristics. At first they closely reflect the meanings often given first in most dictionaries. Modals are always the first word in a verb group and have only one form. All modals except for "ought to" are followed the base form of a verb.

I must leave fairly soon.

I think it will look rather nice.

Things might have been so different.

People may be watching.

"Ought" is always followed by a to-infinitive.

She ought to go straight back to England.

Sam ought to have realized how dangerous it was.

You ought to be doing this.

Modals do not normally indicate the time when something happens. There are, however, a few exceptions.

`Shall' and `will' often indicate a future event or situation.

I shall do what you suggested.

He will not return for many hours.

`Could' is used as the past form of `can' to express ability. `Would' is used as the past form of `will' to express the future.

When I was young, I could run for miles.

He remembered that he would see his mother the next day.

In spoken English and informal written English, `shall' and `will' are shortened to `-'ll', and `would' to `-'d', and added to a pronoun.

I'll see you tomorrow.

I hope you'll agree.

Posy said she'd love to stay.

Shall', `will', and `would' are never shortened if they come at the end of a sentence.

Paul said he would come, and I hope he will.

In spoken English, you can also add `-'ll' and `-'d' to nouns.

My car'll be outside.

The headmaster's be furious.

Remember that `-d' is also the short form of the auxiliary `had'.

I'd heard it many times.

* *You use negative words with modals to make negative clauses.*
* *Modals go in front of the subject in questions.*
* *You never use two modals together*

To make a clause negative, you put a negative word immediately after the modal.

You must not worry.

I can never remember his name.

He ought not to have done that.

`**Can not'** is always written as one word, `**cannot'**.

I cannot go back.

However, **if** `can' is followed by `**not only'**, `**can'** and `**not'** are not joined.

We can not only book your flight for you, but also advise you about hotels.

In spoken English and informal written English, `not' is often shortened to `-**n't'** and added to the modal. The following modals are often shortened in this way:

could not- couldn't

should not- shouldn't

must not- mustn't

would not- wouldn't

We couldn't leave the farm.

You mustn't talk about Ron like that.

Note the following irregular short forms:

shall not-shan't

will not-won't

cannot-can't

I shan't let you go.

Won't you change your mind?

We can't stop now.

`**Might no**t' and `**ought not'** are sometimes shortened to `**mightn'**t' and `**oughtn't'.**

Note that `may not' is very rarely shortened to `mayn't' in modern English. To make a question, you put the modal in front of the subject.

Could you give me an example?

Will you be coming in later?

Shall I shut the door?

You never use two modals together. For example, you cannot say `He will can come'. Instead you can say `He will be able to come'.

I shall have to go.

Your husband might have to give up work.

Instead of using modals, you can often use other verbs and expressions to make requests, offers, or suggestions, to express wishes or intentions, or to show that you are being polite.

For example, `**be able to'** is used instead of `**can**', `be likely to' is used instead of `might', and `have to' is used instead of `must'.[4]

> *All members are able to claim expenses.*

> *I think that we are likely to see more of this.*

These expressions are also used after modals.

> *I really thought I wouldn't be able to visit you this week.*

---

[4] Garner, Bryan A. (2003). Garner's Modern American Usage. Oxford University Press. p. 810.

2. Primary and secondary functions of modal verbs.

Modals have two major functions which can be defined as **primary** and **secondary.**

In their primary function, modal verbs closely reflect the meanings often given first in most dictionaries, so that:

-can-could relate mainly to ability: I can lift 25 kg.

-may-might relate mainly to permission: you may leave early.

-will-would relate mainly to prediction: it will rain soon.

-shall after I/We relates mainly to prediction: can we find our way home?-I am sure we shall.

-must relates mainly to inescapable obligation: You must be quiet.

-needn't relates to absence of obligation: You needn't wait

The general theme in both the primary and secondary uses of modal **will** is the same as the theme of temporal will, namely futurity.[5] In its primary uses, the modal will adds to the ides of futurity an expression either of volition or of confident certainty that a future event will take place, the speaker may be expressing his own volition about his own or other people's actions, or he may be attributing volition to a third party. Naturally, volition is only likely to be expressed about an action or state that is subject to human control, whether the verb is in the active voice (Someone will do that) or the passive (That will be done). We are therefore more likely to find volition expressed in an action verb than in a stative verb referring to involuntary activity.

In their secondary function, nine of the modal auxiliaries (not shall) can be used to express the degree of certainty/uncertainty a speaker feels about a possibility, they can be arranged on a scale from the greatest uncertainty (might) to the greatest certainty (must). The order of modals between might and must is not

---

[5] Fowler's Dictionary of Modern English Usage (4th ed.). Oxford University Press. p. 853.

fixed absolutely. It varies according to situation. For example, one arrangement might be;[6]

	Might	very uncertain
	May	
	Could	
	Can	
YOU	Should	be right
	Ought to	have been right
	Would	
	Will	
	Must	almost certain

You are right. (certain)

Can requires qualification to be used in this way.

He can hardly be right

Do you think he can be right?

I don't think he can be right

We use may and might to say that something is possible. There is no important difference between them. Usually you can use may or might you can say:

- It may be true. Or it might be true. (= perhaps it is true) the expressions "to be allowed and to be permitted" which have the same meaning, can be used to supply the missing forms of the verb may.

- "May I come alone" asked Karen.

- You are to stay in bed until you are allowed to get up.

- "May" express permission, uncertainty, possibility, reproach.

- May I use your phone?

---

[6] Quirk, Randolph; Greenbaum, Sidney; Leech, Geoffrey; Svartvik, Jan (1985). A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Harlow: Longman. p. 140.

- At any rate she murmured something to the effect that he might stay if he wished.

Uncertainty as to the fulfillment of an action, state or occurrence, supposition implying doubt

- "You may think you are very old", he said, "but you strike me as extremely young".

- She was and remains are a riddle to me. She may and she may not prove to be riddle to you

When uncertainty is expressed the time of the action is indicated by the form of the infinitive and not by the form of the modal verb, as both may and might can refer to the present ore t the past in accordance with the form of the infinitive. If the action refers to the past, the perfect infinitive is used.

Primary and secondary functions of must compared. In its primary function it requires another full verb to make up its "missing parts". (in the same way can, for example, in its primary function requires the full verb be able to make up its missing part). In its secondary function must has only two basic forms: a form which relates to the present and a for, which relates to the perfect or past.

Infinitive; to have to leave

Inf form; having to leave

Present; they must leave

Future; they must leave tomorrow

Perfect; they have had to leave

Past; they had to leave

Past perfect; they had had to leave

Future perfect; they will; have had to leave

Conditional; they would have had to leave

3. The usage of modal verbs in expressing obligation and necessity.

Each of the modal verbs expresses different levels, such as obligation, advice, necessity, ability, permission and others. Some modal verbs are used to show speaker's obligation which he or she must, need, have to, be obliged to, should, ought to, be to do something generally or at that moment. When we speak about our obligation, we use these modal verbs. And these modal verbs help human to be beautiful their speech and abbreviate their sentences.

When you want to say that someone has an obligation to do something, or that it is necessary for them to do it, you use `must' or `have to'.

> *You must come to the meeting tomorrow.*
>
> *The plants must have plenty of sunshine.*
>
> *I enjoy parties, unless I have to make a speech.*
>
> *He has to travel to find work.*

There is sometimes a difference between `must' and `have to'. When you are stating your own opinion that something is an obligation or a necessity, you normally use `**must'.**

> *I must be very careful not to upset him.*
>
> *We must eat before we go.*
>
> *He must stop working so hard.*

When you are giving information about what someone else considers to be an obligation or a necessity, you normally use `**have to'.**

> *They have to pay the bill by Thursday.*
>
> *She has to go now.*

Note that you normally use `have to' for things that happen repeatedly, especially with adverbs of frequency such as `often', `always', and `regularly'[7].

> *I always have to do the shopping.*
>
> *You often have to wait a long time for a bus.*

---

[7] Merriam-Webster's Concise Dictionary of English Usage. Merriam-Webster. 2002. p. 98.

You use `must not' or `mustn't' to say that it is important that something is not done or does not happen.

You must not talk about politics.

They mustn't find out that I came here.

Note that `must not' does not mean the same as `not have to'. If you `must not' do something, it is important that you do not do it.

If you `do not have to' do something, it is not necessary for you to do it, but you can do it if you want.

You only use `must' for obligation and necessity in the present and the future. When you want to talk about obligation and necessity in the past, you use `**had to'** rather than `must'.

She had to catch the six o'clock train.

I had to wear a suit.

You use `do', `does', or `did' when you want to make a question using `have to' and `not have to'.

How often do you have to buy petrol for the car?

Does he have to take so long to get ready?

What did you have to do?

Don't you have to be there at one o'clock?

You do not normally form questions like these by putting a form of `have' before the subject. For example, you do not normally say `How often have you to buy petrol?'

In informal English, you can use `**have got to'** instead of `**have to'.**

You've just got to make sure you tell him.

She's got to see the doctor.

Have you got to go so soon?

You normally use `had to', not `had got to', for the past.

He had to know.

I had to lend him some money.

You can only use `have to', not `must', if you are using another modal, or if you want to use an `-ing' form[8], a past participle, or a `to'-infinitive.

They may have to be paid by cheque.

She grumbled a lot about having to stay abroad.

I would have had to go through London.

He doesn't like to have to do the same job every day.

You can use `need to' to talk about the necessity of doing something.

You might need to see a doctor.

A number of questions need to be asked.

You use `don't have to' when there is no obligation or necessity to do something.

Many women don't have to work.

You don't have to learn any new typing skills.

You can also use `don't need to', `haven't got to', or `needn't' to say that there is no obligation or necessity to do something.

You don't need to buy anything.

I haven't got to go to work today.

I can pick John up. You needn't bother.

You also use `needn't' when you are giving someone permission not to do something.

You needn't say anything if you don't want to.

You needn't stay any longer tonight.

You use `need not have' or `needn't have' and a past participle to say that someone did something which was not necessary. You are often implying that the person did not know at the time that their action was not necessary.

I needn't have waited until the game began.

Nell needn't have worked.

They needn't have worried about Reagan.

---

[8] Fleischman, Suzanne, The Future in Thought and Action, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1982, p. 102.

You use `**didn't need to'** to say that something was not necessary, and that it was known at the time that the action was not necessary. You do not know if the action was done, unless you are given more information.

They didn't need to talk about it.

I didn't need to worry.

You also use `didn't have to' to say that it was not necessary to do something.

He didn't have to speak.

Bill and I didn't have to pay.

You cannot use `must' to refer to the past, so when you want to say that it was important that something did not happen or was not done, you use other expressions.

You can say `It was important not to', or use phrases like `had to make sure' or `had to make certain' in a negative sentence.

It was important not to take the game too seriously.

It was necessary that no one was aware of being watched.

You had to make sure that you didn't spend too much.

We had to do our best to make certain that it wasn't out of date.

You use `should' and `ought' to talk about mild obligation.

You can use `should' and `ought' to talk about a mild obligation to do something. When you use `should' and `ought', you are saying that the feeling of obligation is not as strong as when you use `must'.

Should' and `ought' are very common in spoken English. Should' is followed by the base form of a verb, but `ought' is followed by a `to'-infinitive.

When you want to say that there is a mild obligation not to do something, you use `should not', `shouldn't, `ought not', or `oughtn't'.

You use `should' and `ought' in three main ways:

- when you are talking about what is a good thing to do, or the right thing to do.

We should send her a postcard.

We shouldn't spend all the money.

He ought to come more often.

You ought not to see him again.

- when you are trying to advise someone about what to do or what not to do.

You should claim your pension 3-4 months before you retire.

You shouldn't use a detergent.

You ought to get a new TV.

You oughtn't to marry him.

- when you are giving or asking for an opinion about a situation. You often use `I think', `I don't think', or `Do you think' to start the sentence.

I think that we should be paid more.

I don't think we ought to grumble.

Do you think he ought not to go?

What do you think we should do?

You use `should have' or `ought to have' and a past participle to say that there was a mild obligation to do something in the past, but that it was not done. For example, if you say `I should have given him the money yesterday', you mean that you had a mild obligation to give him the money yesterday, but you did not give it to him.

I should have finished my drink and gone home.

You should have realized that he was joking.

We ought to have stayed in tonight.

They ought to have taken a taxi.

You use `should not have' or `ought not to have' and a past participle to say that it was important not to do something in the past, but that it was done. For example, if you say `I should not have left the door open', you mean that it was important that you did not leave the door open, but you did leave it open.

I should not have said that.

You shouldn't have given him the money.

They ought not to have told him.

She oughtn't to have sold the ring.

You use `had better' followed by a base form to indicate mild obligation to do something in a particular situation. You also use `had better' when giving advice or when giving your opinion about something. The negative is `had better not'.

I think I had better show this to you now.

You'd better go tomorrow.

I'd better not look at this.

The correct form is always `had better' (not `have better'). You do not use `had better' to talk about mild obligation in the past, even though it looks like a past form.

4. The principal English modal verbs and their definition.

Can and could.   The modal   verb can expresses possibility in either a dynamic, deontic or epistemic sense,   that   is,   in   terms   of   innate   ability, permissibility, or possible circumstance.[9] For example:

I can speak English means "I am able to speak English" or "I know how to speak English". You can smoke here means "you may (are permitted to) smoke here" (in formal   English may or might is   sometimes   considered   more   correct than can or could in   these   senses).   There   can   be   strong   rivalry   between sibling's means that such rivalry is possible. The preterit form could is used as the past tense   or   conditional   form   of can in   the   above   meanings   (see Past forms above). It is also used to express possible circumstance: We could be in trouble here. It is preferable to use could, may or might rather than can when expressing possible circumstance in a particular situation (as opposed to the general case, as in the "rivalry"[10] example above, where can or may is used). Both can and could can be used to make requests: Can/could you pass me the cheese? means *"Please   pass   me   the   cheese" (where could indicates   greater politeness).* It is common to use can with verbs of perception such as see, hear, etc., as in I can see a tree. Aspectual distinctions can be made, such as I could see it (ongoing state) vs. I saw it (event).

The use of could with the perfect infinitive express past ability or possibility, either in some counterfactual circumstance (I could have told him if I had seen him), or in some real circumstance where the act in question was not in fact realized: I could have told him yesterday (but in fact I didn't). The use of can with the perfect infinitive, can have..., is a rarer alternative to may have... The negation of can is the single word cannot, only occasionally written separately as can not. Though cannot is preferred (as can not is potentially ambiguous), its irregularity (all other unconstructed verbal negations use at least two words) sometimes causes those unfamiliar with the nuances of English spelling to use the separated form. Its

---

[9] Comrie, Bernard, Tense, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985, p. 47.
[10] Oxford Practice Grammar (Advanced), George Yule, Oxford University, p. 40.

contracted form is can't (pronounced /ka:nt/ in RP and some other dialects). The negation of could is the regular could not, contracted to couldn't. The negative forms reverse the meaning of the modal (to express inability, impermissibility or impossibility)[11]. This differs from the case with may or might used to express possibility: it can't be true has a different meaning than it may not be true.

Thus can't (or cannot) is often used to express disbelief in the possibility of something, as must expresses belief in the certainty of something. When the circumstance in question refers to the past, the form with the perfect infinitive is used: he can't (cannot) have done it means "I believe it impossible that he did it" (compare he must have done it). Occasionally not is applied to the infinitive rather than to the modal (stress would then be applied to make the meaning clear): I could not do that, but I'm going to do it anyway.

May and might. The verb may expresses possibility in either an epistemic or deontic sense, that is, in terms of possible circumstance or permissibility. For example: *The mouse may be dead means that it is possible that the mouse is dead*. You may leave the room means that the listener is permitted to leave the room. In expressing possible circumstance, may can have future as well as present reference (he may arrive means that it is possible that he will arrive; I may go to the mall means that I am considering going to the mall). The preterit form might is used as a synonym for may when expressing possible circumstance (as can could – see above). It is sometimes said that might and could express a greater degree of doubt than may. For uses of might in conditional sentences, and as a past equivalent to may in such contexts as indirect speech, see Past forms above. May (or might) can also express irrelevance in spite of certain or likely truth: He may be taller than I am, but he is certainly not stronger could mean "While it is (or may be) true that he is taller than I am, that does not make a difference, as he is certainly not stronger."

May can indicate presently given permission for present or future actions: You may go now. Might used in this way is milder: You might go now if

[11] Kenneth G. Wilson, "Double Modal Auxiliaries", The Columbia Guide to Standard American English, 1993, p. 79.

you feel like it. Similarly May I use your phone? is a request for permission (might would be more hesitant or polite).

A less common use of may is to express wishes, as in May you live long and happy or May the Force be with you (see also English subjunctive).

When used with the perfect infinitive, may have indicates uncertainty about a past circumstance, whereas might have can have that meaning, but it can also refer to possibilities that did not occur but could have in other circumstances (see also conditional sentences above).

She may have eaten the cake (the speaker does not know whether she ate cake).

She might have eaten cake (this means either the same as the above, or else means that she did not eat cake but that it was or would have been possible for her to eat cake).

Note that the above perfect forms refer to possibility, not permission (although the second sense of might have might sometimes imply permission[12]).

The negated form of may is may not; this does not have a common contraction (mayn't is obsolete). The negation of might is might not; this is sometimes contracted to mightn't, mostly in tag questions and in other questions expressing doubt (Mightn't I come in if I took my boots off?).

The meaning of the negated form depends on the usage of the modal. When possibility is indicated, the negation effectively applies to the main verb rather than the modal: That may/might not be means "That may/might not-be", i.e. "That may fail to be true". But when permission is being expressed, the negation applies to the modal or entire verb phrase: You may not go now means "You are not permitted to go now" (except in rare cases where not and the main verb are both stressed to indicate that they go together: You may go or not go, whichever you wish).

Shall and should (*Main article: Shall and will*). The verb shall is used in some varieties of English in place of will, indicating futurity, when the subject is first person (I shall, we shall). With second- and third-person

---

[12] David Rubin, "might could (double modal)", The Mavens' Word of the Day, Random House, November 20, 2000, p. 63.

subjects, shall indicates an order, command or prophecy: Cinderella, you shall go to the ball! It is often used in writing laws and specifications: Those convicted of violating this law shall be imprisoned for a term of not less than three years; The electronics assembly shall be able to operate within a normal temperature range. Shall is sometimes used in questions (in the first, or possibly third, person) to ask for advice or confirmation of a suggestion: Shall I read now?; What shall we wear?

Should is sometimes used as a first-person equivalent[13] for would (in its conditional and "future-in-the-past" uses), in the same way that shall can replace will. Should is also used to form a replacement for the present subjunctive in some varieties of English, and also in some conditional sentences with hypothetical future reference − see English subjunctive and English conditional sentences[14]. Should is often used to describe an expected or recommended behavior or circumstance. It can be used to give advice or to describe normative behavior, though without such strong obligatory force as must or have to. Thus You should never lie describes a social or ethical norm. It can also express what will happen according to theory or expectations: This should work. In these uses it is equivalent to ought to. Both shall and should can be used with the perfect infinitive (shall/should have (done)) in their role as first-person equivalents of will and would (thus to form future perfect or conditional perfect structures). Also shall have may express an order with perfect aspect (you shall have finished your duties by nine o'clock). When should is used in this way it usually expresses something which would have been expected, or normatively required, at some time in the past, but which did not in fact happen (or is not known to have happened): I should have done that yesterday ("it would have been expedient, or expected of me, to do that yesterday")[15].

The negative forms are shall not and should not, contracted to shan't and shouldn't. The negation effectively applies to the main verb rather

---

[13] David Rubin, "might could (double modal)", The Mavens' Word of the Day, Random House, November 20, 2000, p. 155.

[14] Comrie, Bernard, Tense, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985, p. 202.

[15] Kenneth G. Wilson, "Double Modal Auxiliaries", The Columbia Guide to Standard American English, 1993, p. 85.

than the auxiliary: you should not do this implies not merely that there is no need to do it, but that there is a need not to do it.

Will and would. The modal will is often used to express futurity (The next meeting will be held on Thursday). Since this is an expression of time rather than modality, constructions with will (or sometimes shall; see above and at shall and will) are often referred to as the future tense of English, and forms like will do, will be doing, will have done and will have been doing are often called the simple future, future progressive (or future continuous), future perfect, and future perfect progressive (continuous). With first-person subjects (I, we), in varieties where shall is used for simple expression of futurity, the use of will indicates particular willingness or determination.

Future events are also sometimes referred to using the present tense (see Uses of English verb forms), or using the going to construction.
Will as a modal also has a number of different uses:

It can express habitual aspect; for example, he will make mistakes may mean that he frequently makes mistakes (here the word will is usually stressed somewhat, and often expresses annoyance).

It can express strong probability with present time reference, as in That will be John at the door.

It can be used to give an order, as in You will do it right now.

The preterit form would is used in some conditional sentences, and as a past form of future will as described above under Past forms. (It is sometimes replaced by should in the first person in the same way that will is replaced by shall.) Other uses of would include:

Expression of politeness, as in I would like... (for "I want") and Would you (be so kind as to) do this? (for "Please do this").

Expression of habitual aspect in past time, as in Back then, I would eat early and would walk to school.

Both will and would can be used with the perfect infinitive (will have, would have), either to form the future perfect and conditional perfect forms already

referred to, or to express perfect aspect in their other meanings (e.g. there will have been an arrest order, expressing strong probability).

The negated forms are will not (contracted to won't) and would not (contracted to wouldn't). In the modal meanings of will the negation is effectively applied to the main verb phrase and not to the modality (e.g. when expressing an order, you will not do it expresses an order not to do it, rather than just the absence of an order to do it).

For contracted forms of will and would themselves, see Contractions and reduced pronunciation above

Must and had to. The modal must expresses obligation or necessity: You must use this form; We must try to escape. It can also express a confident assumption (the epistemic rather than deontic use), such as in It must be here somewhere.

An alternative to must is the expression had to (in the present tense sometimes have got to), which is often more idiomatic in informal English when referring to obligation. This also provides other forms in which must is defective and enables simple negation When used with the perfect infinitive *(i.e. with have and the past participle),* must expresses only assumption: Sue must have left means that the speaker confidently assumes that Sue has left. To express obligation or necessity in the past, had to or some other synonym must be used.

The formal negation of must is must not (contracted to mustn't). However the negation effectively applies to the main verb, not the modality: You must not do this means that you are required not to do it, not just that you are not required doing it. To express the lack of requirement or obligation, the negative of have to or need (see below) can be used: You don't have to do it; You needn't do it.

The above negative forms are not usually used in the sense of confident assumption; here it is common to use can't to express confidence that something is not the case (as in It can't be here or, with the perfect, Sue can't have left).

Mustn't can nonetheless be used as a simple negative of must in tag questions and other questions expressing doubt: We must do it, mustn't we? Mustn't he be in the operating room by this stage?

Ought to and had better. Ought to is used with meanings similar to those of should expressing expectation or requirement. The principal grammatical difference is that ought is used with the to-infinitive rather than the bare infinitive, hence we should go is equivalent to we ought to go. Because of this difference of syntax, ought is sometimes excluded from the class of modal verbs, or is classed as a semi modal. The reduced pronunciation of ought to (see Contractions and reduced pronunciation above) is sometimes given the eye dialect spelling ought to[16].

Ought can be used with perfect infinitives in the same way as should (but again with the insertion of to): you ought to have done that earlier.

The negated form is ought not or oughtn't, equivalent in meaning to shouldn't (but again used with to). The expression had better has similar meaning to should and ought when expressing recommended or expedient behavior: I had better get down to work (it can also be used to give instructions with the implication of a threat: you had better give me the money or else).

The had of this expression is similar to a modal: it governs the bare infinitive, it is defective in that it is not replaceable by any other form of the verb have, and it behaves syntactically as an auxiliary verb. For this reason the expression had better, considered as a kind of compound verb, is sometimes classed along with the modals or as a semi modal.

The had of had better can be contracted to 'd, or in some informal usage (especially American) can be omitted. The expression can be used with a perfect infinitive: you'd better have finished that report by tomorrow. There is a negative form hadn't better, used mainly in questions:[17] Hadn't we better start now? It is

---

[16] David Rubin, "might could (double modal)", The Mavens' Word of the Day, Random House, November 20, 2000, p. 301.

[17]Warner, Anthony R., English Auxiliaries, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993, p. 144.

more common for the infinitive to be negated by means of not after better: You'd better not do that (meaning that you are strongly advised not to do that).

Used to. The verbal expression used to expresses past states or past habitual actions, usually with the implication that they are no longer so. It is followed by the infinitive (that is, the full expression consists of the verb used plus the to-infinitive). Thus the statement I used to go to college means that the speaker formerly habitually went to college, and normally implies that this is no longer the case.

While used to does not express modality, it has some similarities with modal auxiliaries in that it is invariant and defective in form and can follow auxiliary-verb syntax: it is possible to form questions like Used he to come here? and negatives like He used not (rarely usedn't) to come here. More common, however, (though not the most formal style) is the syntax that treats used as a past tense of an ordinary verb, and forms questions and negatives using did: Did he use(d) to come here? He didn't use (d) to come here.[a]

The verbal use of used to should not be confused with the adjectival use of the same expression, meaning "familiar with", as in I am used to this, we must get used to the cold. When the adjectival form is followed by a verb, the gerund is used: I am used to going to college in the mornings.

Conclusion

Each of the using of modal functions helps to be clear our speak, express a variety of moods or attitudes towards a possible state or action. Using modals in oral or written language is easy to describe what we say or think about something and it will clear to listener to understand your mind what are you going to tell or how are you going to show your mood? And your speech will be more beautiful or stronger then other simple speech.

Pupils come to school with many of their habits of expression already formed on bad models, so they must give some attention to the special work of pointing out common errors of speech. That's why we must use grammar rules in correct ways not only in written language, but also in oral language.

I learnt fully about modal verbs over my course work. I understand that modal verbs are special verbs which behave very differently from normal verbs. And they generally express speakers' attitudes. Modal verbs are not used independently in the English language; they follow main verbs to give extra sense.

We can see that the English use some modal verbs to express their general attitudes, moods, or other relationship with someone else. And I also knew which modal verbs express obligation, necessity, and others. In addition, I learnt their primary and secondary functions, how to use them.

It is the firs time in my life I have attempted to write course work. I have tried to create a work that will be an easy to use. I also hope that it will be prove to be a reliable and indispensable companion to anyone who interested in the English language.

The list of used literature.

1. Palmer, F. R., Mood and Modality, Cambridge Univ. Press, second edition, 2001.

2. A Linguistic Study of the English Verb, Longmans, 1965.

3. Warner, Anthony R., English Auxiliaries, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1993

4. Garner, Bryan A. (2003). Garner's Modern American Usage. Oxford University Press. p. 810. ISBN 978-0-19-516191-5. Butterfield, eds. (2015).

5. Fowler's Dictionary of Modern English Usage (4th ed.). Oxford University Press. p. 853. ISBN 978-0- 199-66135-0.

6. Quirk, Randolph; Greenbaum, Sidney; Leech, Geoffrey; Svartvik, Jan (1985). A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. Harlow: Longman. p. 140. ISBN 978-0-582-51734-9.

7. Merriam-Webster's Concise Dictionary of English Usage. Merriam-Webster. 2002. pp. 760–761.ISBN 978-0-87779-633-6.

8. Fleischman, Suzanne, The Future in Thought and Action, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1982, pp. 86-97.

9. Comrie, Bernard, Tense, Cambridge Univ. Press, 1985, pp. 21, 47-48. "UltraLingua Online Dictionary & Grammar.

10. Oxford Practice Grammar (Advanced), George Yule, Oxford University Press ISBN 9780194327541 Page:40

11. Kenneth G. Wilson, "Double Modal Auxiliaries", The Columbia Guide to Standard American English, 1993.

12. David Rubin, "might could (double modal)", The Mavens' Word of the Day, Random House, November 20, 2000.