

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine
Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv
Educational and Scientific Institute of Philology
Department of English Philology and Intercultural Communication

Bachelor's paper
EXPRESSING MODALITY IN ENGLISH

Sobolyeva Valeriya Andriyivna
4th year student of the Education Program
'English Studies and Translation
and Two Western European Languages'
Field of science: 03 "Humanities"
Specialty: 035 "Philology"

Supervisor:
Kaptiurova Olena Viacheslavivna
PhD, Associate Professor

Допущено до захисту»

Протокол засідання кафедри англійської філології
та міжкультурної комунікації

Протокол № 10 від 29.05.2023

Зав. кафедри _____ д. філол. н., проф. Алла БЄЛОВА

KYIV – 2023

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION.....	3
I. Theoretical Foundations of Studying Modality in English Grammar...	5
1.1 The category of modality in English grammar	5
1.1.1 Earlier approaches to modality.....	6
1.1.2 Modern definitions: discursive and cognitive approaches.....	11
1.2 Types of modality.....	13
1.2.1 Logical modality.....	14
1.2.2 Epistemic modality	15
1.2.3 Deontic modality	16
1.2.4 Axiological modality	17
Conclusion to Part 1.....	20
II. Linguistic means of expressing modality in English.....	22
2.1 The category of mood of the verb.....	22
2.2 Modal verbs	27
2.2.1 Can.....	27
2.2.2 May.....	31
2.2.3 Must.....	34
2.2.4 Should and ought to	38
2.2.5 Shall and will.....	39
2.3 Other lexical ways of expressing modality.....	41
Conclusion to Part 2.....	44
CONCLUSION.....	45
REFERENCES.....	49
SUMMARY.....	55

INTRODUCTION

Modality, as a fundamental aspect of language, plays a crucial role in conveying a wide range of meanings related to possibility, necessity, permission, ability, and volition [28, p. 4].

Modality has been studied from various perspectives in linguistics, each offering unique insights into different aspects of this complex linguistic phenomenon. In *traditional grammar*, the formal properties and syntactic patterns of modal expressions are analyzed, categorizing them into distinct classes [3; 16]. From *semantic perspective*, the linguists analyze how the meaning of modal expressions uncover the underlying semantic dimensions of modality [15; 19]. *Pragmatic studies* are focused on the use of modal expressions in discourse and different communicative contexts [21]. *Cognitive linguistics* investigates how modal expressions are grounded in conceptualization processes, cognitive structures, and embodied experiences [7; 10; 11; 24]. *The cross-linguistic perspective* compares and contrasts modal systems across different languages [5; 27]. *Sociolinguistics* considers how social variables, such as age, gender, social status, and regional or dialectal variations, impact the choice and frequency of modal expressions [29; 30].

The relevance of this research is explained by the fact that understanding the complexities of modality requires a multidimensional approach that encompasses linguistic, cognitive, and discourse perspectives. Therefore, this paper views modality as an integral part of human cognition and conceptualization, and explains how a speaker conveys his/her subjective stance, uncertainty, asserts authority, negotiates social relationships, and shapes discourse patterns.

The object of the research is the lexical and grammatical means of expressing modality and their role and functions in communication.

The subject is represented by the analysis of verb-predicates, modal verbs and related expressions.

The aim of this bachelor's paper is to explore the linguistic means of expressing modality in English.

In order to fulfill the aim of the research, it is important to outline the following **tasks**:

- 1) To define modality in English from different perspectives.
- 2) To identify language means expressing modality in English.
- 3) To analyze moods of the predicate-verbs.
- 4) To explain the meanings and functions of modal verbs and related expressions.

The objectives of this study are twofold. Firstly, we aim to provide a comprehensive overview of the theoretical foundations of modality, exploring key concepts and frameworks proposed by prominent linguists. Secondly, we seek to analyze the functions of modal verbs and expressions in different contexts. This includes investigating how modal expressions influence the speaker's subjective stance, convey uncertainty, assert authority, negotiate social relationships, and shape discourse patterns.

Solving this set of goals is supported by the method of system analysis, which is of crucial importance for such type of investigation, and some other specific scientific **methods and techniques**: description (in characterizing modality and the expressions which convey it); semantic analysis (in the analysis of meaning of the expressions); contextual analysis (in identifying the realization of meanings in context).

The material for this paper includes authentic language data from a range of sources, including written texts, spoken interactions, and digital communication, that we obtained from the Internet.

This study consists of two parts. **The first part** provides the theoretical foundations of studying modality in English: the category of modality in English grammar is reviewed from earlier approaches to modern interpretations. Also types of modality are discussed in Part 1. **The second part** analyses the linguistic means of expressing modality in English: the category of mood of the verb, modal verbs and other lexical ways of expressing modality.

PART 1

THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF STUDYING MODALITY IN ENGLISH GRAMMAR

Modality refers to the grammatical and semantic expression of possibility, necessity, ability, permission, and other related concepts in a language. It helps to convey the speaker's attitude or stance towards the proposition expressed in a sentence / utterance [4, P. 28]. Modality plays a crucial role in shaping the tone, politeness, and pragmatics of a sentence. It allows speakers to indicate their level of certainty or uncertainty, assertiveness, permission or prohibition, and ensure hedging in their discourse through the use of modal verbs, adverbs, phrases, and constructions [12]. This part of the thesis provides an overview of the category of modality in English from earlier approaches to modern interpretations and highlights types of modality.

1.1 The category of modality in English grammar

In English grammar, modality is a morphological category that deals with the expression of the speaker's subjective attitudes, opinions, judgments, and expectations regarding an action, event, or state [14, p. 12]. It includes the notions of certainty or uncertainty, probability, obligation, and ability with various shades of meaning such as strong or weak possibility or necessity, speaker's volition, permission, prohibition, as well as circumstantial ability and likelihood [15, 234].

Formal markers of modality encompass three types of linguistic expressions. Firstly, modality is manifested through the use of modal verbs or modal auxiliary verbs, such as *can, could, may, might, shall, should, will, would, must, ought to, and need*, which indicate various degrees of certainty, obligation, ability, and permission. Secondly, it also involves the use of modal adverbs and phrases, such as *probably, possibly, likely, certainly, perhaps, definitely, surely, necessarily, obligatorily, and voluntarily*, modifying the meaning of a proposition and express the speaker's stance. And thirdly, modality includes modal constructions, such as conditional

sentences (*I would go there immediately*), hypothetical statements (*Suppose it was summer and we were in Greece*), and subjunctive clauses (*If I were you*), to express situations that are contrary to reality or uncertain in their nature [16].

Modality as the grammatical category has been discussed in Linguistics from Aristotelian times up to now. The earlier interpretations ground mainly on logical rules and treat modality as an indicator of the utterance being true or false, possible or necessary, while recent – cognitive and discursive – approaches explain modality as a feature of language that allows speakers to convey their stance towards an event, situation, or proposition [7]. The next sections provide an account of these approaches.

1.1.1 Earlier approaches to modality

Modality was first mentioned by Aristotle. In fact, he did not specifically address modality in grammar as it is understood in modern linguistic terms. However, he did discuss it in a broader philosophical sense, particularly in relation to his theory of logic and the classification of propositions [4]. The term «proposition» refers to a unit of meaning that expresses a complete thought or idea. It is often associated with a sentence or clause that functions as a statement and make a claim or assertion about something [19]. In his works on logic, particularly in his treatise *Prior Analytics*, Aristotle distinguished between different types of propositions based on their modalities [28]. He recognized three basic modalities: necessity, possibility, and impossibility.

Necessary propositions are statements that are necessarily true and cannot be otherwise, e.g. *All humans are mortal*. According to Aristotle, such propositions are universally and necessarily true [ibid.].

Possible propositions are statements that are potentially true but are not verified for now, because they could be true under certain conditions, E.g. *It might rain tomorrow*. In this sentence, the condition is that we need to wait till tomorrow to check if this is true or false. That's why Aristotle regarded possible propositions as not yet determined [ibid.].

Impossible propositions are statements that are inherently contradictory and cannot be true under any circumstances, e.g. *A square circle exists*. Aristotle considered impossible propositions as necessarily false [ibid.].

Aristotle's view of modality was primarily concerned with the logical relationships between propositions and their truth values. While his discussions of modality were not focused on grammar in the modern sense, his insights laid the foundation for later developments in logic and linguistic philosophy.

After Aristotle, the study of modality continued to evolve. Stoic philosophers (including Chrysippus and Epictetus) developed the Aristotelian theory of modal logic but they didn't single out any other types of modality. Like Aristotle, they also distinguished between the necessary, the possible, and the impossible modalities. During the Middle Ages, Thomas Aquinas and John Duns Scotus among others, integrated Aristotelian and Stoic ideas into their discussions of modality within the framework of Christian theology and philosophical systems, but again the Aristotelian vision of modality was not modified in any way in their works. Significant contributions to the study of modality were made by Gottfried Wilhelm Leibniz, a prominent philosopher and mathematician of the XVII century. He introduced the concept of the possible worlds, arguing that our world is the "best of all possible worlds." Leibniz also developed a modal logic system to analyze necessary and contingent truths [6].

Later, in the XVIII century, Immanuel Kant explored modality within his philosophical framework and distinguished between analytic and synthetic propositions. In his view, analytic judgments are necessarily true and do not convey any new knowledge, e.g. *All bachelors are unmarried*. It is true by virtue of the definition of what the word *bachelor* means. Synthetic judgments, in contrast, add new information. They connect ideas that are not linked intrinsically. Synthetic judgments can be further divided into contingent and necessary judgments. Contingent synthetic judgments are true and based on empirical evidence and they depend on specific conditions or circumstances. For example, in the sentence *It is*

raining today the truth depends on the current weather conditions. Necessary synthetic judgments are universally true and cannot be otherwise [6].

In the 20th century, logicians such as C.I. Lewis, Saul Kripke, and Roderick Chisholm developed formal systems to study modalities and concepts such as necessity, possibility, and essence. Linguists who studied modality more from grammatical perspective are Henry Sweet and Otto Jespersen.

Henry Sweet, a prominent linguist and phonetician in the late 19th and early 20th centuries, made significant contributions to the study of English grammar, including the topic of modality. While Sweet did not specifically focus on modality in English grammar in any comprehensive works, he discussed aspects of it in his influential book "*A New English Grammar: Logical and Historical*."

In "*A New English Grammar*," Sweet explored various grammatical phenomena in English, including modal expressions. He emphasized the importance of studying the historical development and usage of modals, examining their etymology and changes over time. Sweet also highlighted the semantic nuances and distinctions among modal verbs, such as *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, *must*, *shall*, *should*, *will*, *would*, and others [16].

Sweet's approach to modality in English grammar was influenced by both a logical and historical perspective. He aimed to provide a comprehensive account of English grammar, considering both the logical structure of the language and its evolution throughout history.

Sweet categorized modality into two main types: root modality and epistemic modality [20, P. 485]. Root modality pertains to the expression of necessity, obligation, ability, and permission, while epistemic modality relates to the expression of possibility, probability, certainty, and doubt. He emphasized the central role of modal verbs in conveying modality in English. He discussed how modal verbs like *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, *must*, *shall*, *should*, *will*, *would*, and their past tense forms, express different shades of meaning related to modality [20, P. 486-497].

Sweet recognized the historical development of modal verbs, tracing their origins to Old English and their subsequent evolution in Middle English and Early Modern English. He analyzed the changes in form and usage of modal verbs over time and their correlation with the development of modality in English. He categorized modal verbs into two main classes: primary modals and secondary modals [21].

The primary modals include can, could, may, might, shall, should, will, would, and must. According to Sweet, these modals have an inherent meaning and can express different degrees of certainty, ability, permission, necessity, and volition.

The secondary modals, on the other hand, are derived from other verbs and express modal meanings with the help of auxiliary verbs. For example, the verb "have" in constructions like "could have" and "might have" indicates past possibility or past ability [21].

Sweet examined the syntax and semantics of modal verbs, discussing their ability to interact with other verbs in various constructions and their influence on the meaning and interpretation of a sentence. He explored the modal uses of auxiliary verbs and their functions in expressing modality.

Sweet also delved into the phonetic and phonological aspects of modality, particularly in relation to the pronunciation and prosody of modal verbs. He discussed the phonetic variations and stress patterns associated with modal verbs and their impact on the overall meaning and expression of modality [25, p. 50].

While Sweet's work on modality may not be as extensive as some subsequent scholars, his contributions to the field of linguistics, phonetics, and grammar have had a lasting impact. His insights on the development and usage of modal expressions in English have informed subsequent research and continue to be studied and referenced by linguists today.

Otto Jespersen, a Danish linguist and language scholar, made significant impact in the study of English grammar, including the study of modality. In his book "*A Modern English Grammar on Historical Principles*" (1909-1949), Jespersen

extensively discussed modality and its expression in English. He analyzed modality from both a historical and a descriptive perspective. He traced the development of modal verbs in English, examining their origins, semantic changes, and syntactic patterns over time. He explored how modal verbs evolved from full verbs to auxiliary verbs and acquired their distinct modal meanings [28].

One of Jespersen's notable contributions to the study of modality was his concept of "degree of remoteness." He categorized modal verbs based on their proximity to the speaker's experience or knowledge. According to Jespersen, modal verbs like *can* and *may* represent a greater degree of proximity, indicating more subjective or *immediate possibility*, while modal verbs like *could* and *might* indicate a lower degree of proximity, expressing less subjective or *remote possibility* [18, p. 142].

Jespersen also examined the functions of modal verbs beyond expressing modality. He discussed how modal verbs could serve as tense markers, conditionals, and indirect speech markers, among other uses [30, p. 41]. He analyzed their syntactic behavior and their interaction with other grammatical constructions. In this way he categorized modal verbs into two classes: root modals and epistemic modals [20, p. 486].

Root Modals: Jespersen referred to modals such as *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, *shall*, *should*, *will*, *would*, *must*, and *ought to* as root modals. He explained their basic meanings and how they express various aspects of modality, such as ability, permission, necessity, obligation, and prediction [20, p. 488].

Epistemic Modals: Jespersen introduced the concept of epistemic modality, which relates to the speaker's judgment or belief about the truth or probability of a proposition. He discussed modals like *may*, *might*, and *must* as epistemic modals and explored their usage to express degrees of certainty, probability, and inference [20, p. 493].

Overall, Jespersen's work on modality is a great step forward in analysis of the development, meanings, and usage patterns of modal verbs. His historical and

descriptive approach contributed to a deeper understanding of the role of modality in the English language.

Several other linguists have made notable contributions to the study of modality in English grammar. Here are a few examples:

Randolph Quirk along with his colleagues authored "*A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*" (1985), which extensively covers modality. The work provides detailed descriptions of modal verbs, their meanings, and their usage in different contexts [16].

Frank Palmer's book "*Mood and Modality*" (1986) focuses specifically on the study of modality in English. It examines the semantic and pragmatic aspects of modal verbs and explores their interaction with other grammatical categories [14].

Geoffrey Leech's book "*Meaning and the English Verb*" (1971) includes a comprehensive analysis of modality. It explores the meanings and uses of modal verbs, their semantic distinctions, and their interaction with other verb types. And finally, John R. Searle, a philosopher of language, has written extensively on speech acts and their relation to modality. His work, including "*Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*" (1969), discusses how modal expressions are used to perform different speech acts and convey illocutionary force.

1.1.2 Modern definitions: discursive and cognitive approaches

Modern research into modality focuses on discourse and cognitive linguistic studies.

Discursive approach treats modality as part of the larger discourse analysis framework. Deborah Schiffrin in her seminal book "*Approaches to Discourse*" examines how modal expressions are used to convey speakers' stance, politeness, and subjective evaluation within different communicative contexts.

In discourse analysis, modality refers to the linguistic devices and expressions used to convey speakers' attitudes, beliefs, and judgments regarding the truth, likelihood, or desirability of propositions. It involves the expression of possibility, necessity, probability, certainty, and other similar notions [18, p. 142].

Scholars examining modality in discourse analysis often focus on how speakers use modal expressions, such as modal verbs (e.g., *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, *must*, *should*) and adverbs (e.g., *certainly*, *possibly*, *probably*), to convey their subjective perspectives and to influence the interpretation of their statements. They study how modal expressions shape the meaning and implications of utterances, as well as their pragmatic functions in specific contexts [18, p. 149].

Frank Palmer's work "Modality and the English Modals" (2001) offers an in-depth analysis of the modal verbs in English. It explores their syntactic and semantic properties, their historical development, and their role in expressing modality [14].

Palmer explores the range of interpretations and nuances associated with each modal verb, discussing their uses in different contexts and examining how they interact with other elements in a sentence. He analyzes the semantic and pragmatic aspects of modal meanings and discusses the implications of their use in communication. He also delves into the historical development of the English modal system and traces the origins and changes in the meanings and usage of modal verbs over time. Palmer presents his analysis in a clear and accessible manner, making the book valuable for both students and researchers interested in the study of modality and the English language.

"Modality and the English Modals" is widely regarded as a highly-influential book in the field of linguistics, particularly in the study of modality and the analysis of modal verbs in English. It provides a detailed examination of the intricacies of modal meaning and usage, offering insights into how speakers express their attitudes, beliefs, and judgments through language.

In **cognitive linguistics**, modals are seen as part of a broader category of linguistic expressions called "modal operators" [24, p. 51]. Modal operators include words such as *can*, *could*, *must*, *might*, *should*, and others that express various kinds of possibility, necessity, ability, permission, and volition. According to cognitive linguistics, modals are analyzed in terms of their cognitive and conceptual underpinnings rather than as purely grammatical devices [1, p. 67-71].

One of the most influential cognitive linguists is Ronald Langacker known for his work in the field of cognitive grammar. In his book chapter ‘*Modals: Striving for control*’ Langacker lays out the following aspects of modals:

First, human mind performs a mental operation called ***modal construal***. It is the act when a speaker uses modals and his/her mind performs construal operations that shape the mental representations of events, actions, and states. They contribute to the speaker's subjective perspective on the events being described [1, p. 214].

Secondly, we understand modals in view of ***conceptualization***. That is, modals arise from general cognitive processes involved in conceptualization, such as inference, reasoning, and categorization. They reflect the speaker's evaluation of possibilities, obligations, permissions, and constraints [11, p. 41].

Thirdly, he introduces ***image schemas*** in analyzing modals. Image schemas are recurring patterns of perceptual and motor experiences. They play a role in the understanding and expression of modality. For example, the image schema of ‘container’ may underlie the expression of possibility, e.g., ‘can,’ ‘might’ as a boundary that can or cannot be crossed [11, p. 43].

Finally, he dwells on ***grammaticalization***. Modals are subject to processes of grammaticalization, through which they may evolve from other lexical or grammatical elements [26, p. 38].

Cognitive linguistics examines the historical and cognitive factors involved in the development and usage of modals.

1.2 Types of modality

There are several types of modality that have been identified and studied in linguistics. These types capture different aspects of how speakers convey their perspectives, attitudes, and judgments in language. Here are some of the key types of modality: logical, epistemic, deontic and axiological. Before we analyze them in detail, it is important to note that these types of modality are not always mutually exclusive and can overlap in usage and interpretation. Additionally, the

categorization of modal expressions into specific types may vary across linguistic frameworks and theoretical perspectives.

1.2.1 Logical modality

Here we refer all kinds of necessities and possibilities that refer to practical reasoning [18, p. 143]. For example, if we speculate about how we get to London from Edinburgh, we naturally conclude that it is necessary to leave Scotland to achieve that destination.

In natural languages, however, utterances are characterized not only as true or false with reference to reality, but also concerning speaker's certainty / uncertainty, approval / disapproval, permission, command, etc. So there are many different modalities. It deals with expressions of logical truth, validity, possibility, impossibility, necessity, and contingency.

Logical modality focuses on the logical relationships between statements and their truth values. It allows individuals to express their judgments about the logical coherence, consistency, or validity of an argument or proposition.

Logical modality can be expressed through various linguistic devices, including modal operators (such as "necessarily," "possibly," "impossibly," "conditionally"), logical connectives (such as "and," "or," "not"), quantifiers (such as "all," "some," "none"), and other expressions (such as "if...then," "it follows that," "it is impossible that") [18, p. 144-149].

For example:

"All humans are mortal" expresses a necessary truth.

"Some cats are black" expresses a possibility.

"It is impossible for a square to have five sides" expresses an impossibility.

"If it rains, then the ground will be wet" expresses a logical implication.

Logical modality allows speakers and writers to express their judgments about the logical relationships and validity of statements. It is concerned with the logical consistency, necessity, possibility, or impossibility of propositions, rather than the

subjective or evaluative aspects of language [19]. Logical modality is essential in formal logic, mathematics, and critical reasoning to assess the validity of arguments and the logical implications of statements.

1.2.2 Epistemic modality

Epistemic modality refers to the expression of the speaker's degree of *certainty* or *uncertainty* about the truth or likelihood of a situation described in a sentence / utterance. It deals with the speaker's perspective on the knowledge, belief, or doubt associated with a statement [19, p. 34]. For example, the statement "*It will rain tomorrow*" presupposes that the speaker cannot imagine tomorrow without rain, in other words he or she is absolutely certain about the weather. On the other hand, the sentences *It may rain tomorrow* and *I think it will rain tomorrow* express less certainty about what the true state of affairs will be like tomorrow.

In simpler terms, epistemic modality is concerned with conveying the speaker's opinion, judgment, or assessment of the likelihood or certainty of a particular event or state [20, p. 484]. It allows us to express our confidence or its lack in a statement.

Epistemic modality is often expressed through linguistic means:

- modal verbs, e.g., *might, could, must, should*
- adverbs, e.g., *probably, possibly, likely, certainly*
- expressions that convey the speaker's perspective, e.g. *I think, I believe, it seems*, etc.

Let's analyse more examples:

"*She might be at home*" expresses uncertainty.

"*They must have arrived by now*" expresses certainty.

"*It is probably going to rain tomorrow*" expresses a high degree of likelihood.

"*She may come to the party tonight*" expresses possibility.

"*It is likely to rain tomorrow*" expresses probability.

"*He must be at work by now*" expresses necessity.

"*I'm not sure if they will win the game*" expresses doubt.

Epistemic modality is also interesting from stylistic point of view because it helps us to convey shades of meaning and nuances in our language, allowing us to indicate our confidence or skepticism regarding a particular proposition or statement. Epistemic modality is used to indicate the speaker's assessment of the truth value or likelihood of a statement. It allows them to express their subjective judgment or evaluation about the information being conveyed [25, p. 32]. By using epistemic modality, individuals can indicate how confident they are in the information they are providing.

1.2.3 Deontic modality

Deontic modality is based on the idea of *a norm* [22, p. 354]. The norm refers to what is morally or legally obligatory and permissible. So deontic modality expresses human perception of necessity and possibility in light of various norms and rules that govern our actions. As Nate Charlow and Matthew Chrisman say, “what is morally obligatory is treated as what is necessary to conform to the rules of morality; what is legally permissible is treated as what is possible to do without breaking the law” [6, p. 1]. In this respect, deontic modality differs from epistemic one, since the former concerns what is necessary according to the norms of morality and law, while the latter reveals what is necessary in terms of various bodies of knowledge and information.

Deontic modality is primarily expressed by the modal verbs *must*, *have to*, but the modals *may*, *can*, *should* and *ought to* are capable of conveying deontic meaning as well. As well as that, deontic meaning is expressed by the adjectives *obligatory* and *permissible* and adverbs *necessarily*, *possibly*, and the construction like *Unless the proposed payout is very high, one is to reject the offer* [22, p. 460].

Deontic modality conveys permission, obligation, prohibition, necessity, and related concepts. It is concerned with expressing the speaker's attitudes towards norms, rules, obligations, permissions, and moral or social judgments. It deals with expressions that indicate what is considered appropriate, required, permitted, or

forbidden in a given situation. It focuses on the expressions of necessity, obligation, permission, and prohibition.

For example:

"*You must submit your assignment by tomorrow*" expresses obligation.

"*Employees should arrive on time for the meeting*" expresses recommendation or expectation.

"*It is forbidden to smoke in this area*" expresses prohibition.

"*You are permitted to use this equipment*" expresses permission

Deontic modality allows speakers to convey their stance on what is expected, required, allowed, or prohibited in a given context. It reflects social norms, rules, ethical considerations, and the speaker's or writer's judgment about what is appropriate or necessary in a specific situation.

1.2.4 Axiological modality

Axiological modality, also known as *evaluative modality*, refers to the linguistic expressions that convey the speaker's or writer's evaluation or judgment about something. It deals with expressions of value, desirability, goodness, badness, preference, and related concepts [7].

Axiological modality focuses on the subjective assessment or valuation of an entity, action, event, or situation. It allows individuals to express their attitudes, opinions, preferences, or emotional responses to what they are discussing.

Axiological modality can be expressed through various linguistic devices, including adjectives (such as "good," "bad," "beautiful," "ugly"), adverbs (such as "fortunately," "unfortunately," "amazingly"), verbs (such as "like," "love," "hate," "prefer"), and other expressions (such as "it's wonderful that," "it's terrible that," "I'm happy," "I'm disappointed") [13, p. 101].

Let's analyze the following examples:

"*The movie was excellent*" expresses positive evaluation.

"*She sings beautifully*" expresses admiration.

"*I dislike spicy food*" expresses personal preference.

"*It's unfortunate that they couldn't attend the event*" expresses negative evaluation.

Most scientists agree that the evaluative meaning has its structure. It is included in the context, has the form of a structurally organized modal framework, "which is superimposed on statements and does not coincide either with its logical-semantic construction or with its syntactic" [17, p. 259]. There are 4 main components of the evaluation: subject, object, character and basis.

The subject of evaluation is a person, a social community, a part of society or society as a whole, ascribing the value of an object through evaluation. There are two types of expressing it: explicit (using axiological predicates) and implicit which is associated with difficulties in determining the subject.

The object of evaluation is a thing to which values are attributed or things values of which are compared. In other words, the object of evaluation is the object which is evaluated.

All evaluative adjectives can be divided into two groups. The first of them includes absolute evaluation, using such terms as "good", "bad", "evil", and "indifferent". The second - comparative evaluation which is expressed using terms such as "better", "worse", "equivalent."

The fourth component of the evaluation is the **basis**.

The basis of evaluation is the position or arguments that incline subjects to approval, censure or expression of indifference in connection with various things. [26, p. 40].

The basis of evaluation should be divided into several types.

A large group of evaluative adjectives has as its basis a certain feeling or sensation. For example, "I love you" is usually understood as an expression of sincere feeling. Evaluations that are expressions of feelings of sympathy or indifference, should be called internal. The basis of the evaluation can be not only a feeling but also a certain model, ideal, standard. Usually, when we talk about a knife, that it is good, without any further qualifications, we evaluate it precisely from the

point of view of some standard, which, as we think, every knife must satisfy in order to be evaluated positively [1, p. 22].

Some of the evaluations can be called external or utilitarian: the subject is attributed to a positive, negative or zero value not by itself, but as a means of achieving or eliminating some other things that are evaluated positively or negatively [1, p. 21-31].

A word with an estimated value does not name the attribute objectively belonging to the subject, but its characteristic that determines how the subject of the assessment relates to the subject. Therefore, evaluation is always a subjective-objective category; criteria of truth or falsehood are not applicable to it. Different people can evaluate the same subject in different ways. Moreover, one and the same person can evaluate the same subject, relying on various characteristics of their own.

A necessary condition for evaluation of a particular subject is the presence in the mind of the subject of a certain basis for evaluating specific objects [1, p. 40].

The semantic connection of evaluative adjectives and the designation of the object of evaluation is based on the basis of evaluation, which determines the features of the object by which it is evaluated. For example, “a good cook”- the aspect is related to the function.

An appraisal statement may also include optional elements - motivation, classifiers, various means of intensification and deintensification. In a comparative assessment, additional elements are included in the modal frame [2, p. 12].

To sum it up, the evaluation structure consists of many elements that reflect its complex construction. The main components of the evaluation are: subject, object, character and basis. Axiological modality allows speakers and writers to express their subjective assessment, emotional response, or value judgment about something. It reflects their personal preferences, tastes, aesthetic sensibilities, and their overall evaluation of what is considered desirable, good, or bad in a given context.

Conclusion to Chapter 1

In this first chapter, we have discussed the theoretical foundations of studying modality, exploring both early and modern approaches to understanding this complex linguistic phenomenon. By examining the historical development of modality studies, we have gained valuable insights into the evolution of thought surrounding modal expressions in language.

The early approaches to modality primarily focused on the grammatical and syntactic aspects, often centering on the traditional modal verbs such as *can*, *could*, *may*, and *must*. Scholars during this period sought to establish a set of rules governing the usage of modal verbs, categorizing them based on their epistemic and deontic meanings. These early frameworks provided a solid foundation for subsequent research, paving the way for deeper investigations into the conceptual and cognitive dimensions of modality.

The advent of modern linguistic theories, particularly cognitive linguistics, brought about a paradigm shift in the study of modality. Rather than viewing modality as a rigid grammatical category, modern approaches recognize its inseparable connection with human cognition and conceptualization. Scholars now explore the cognitive and semantic underpinnings of modality, emphasizing the subjective nature of modal expressions and their role in shaping a speaker's perspective on events and states.

Within the realm of modern approaches, various types of modality have been identified and classified. Epistemic modality refers to the speaker's assessment of the likelihood or truth value of a proposition, expressing notions of possibility, probability, certainty, or uncertainty. Deontic modality, on the other hand, deals with the speaker's evaluation of necessity, obligation, permission, or prohibition, relating to normative or moral judgments. These two primary types of modality have been extensively studied and serve as fundamental building blocks for understanding how speakers convey their attitudes, beliefs, and judgments in language.

Beyond epistemic and deontic modality, additional types have been identified, expanding the scope of research in this area. Evaluative modality encompasses

modal expressions that convey the speaker's subjective evaluation or appraisal of a situation or entity.

As we conclude this chapter, we recognize that the theoretical foundations of studying modality have evolved significantly over time. From a focus on grammatical rules and categorization, we have transitioned to a deeper understanding of modality as a cognitive and conceptual phenomenon. In the subsequent chapter of this thesis, we will delve further into the intricacies of modality, examining its grammatical and lexical manifestations, contextual implications, and sociocultural influences.

PART 2

LINGUISTIC MEANS OF EXPRESSING MODALITY IN ENGLISH

2.1 The category of mood of the verb

There has been a great deal of grammatical discussions of mood and modality in English, but still not all linguists involved in these studies are clear and unanimous in their interpretations of mood. Even after more than 2000 years of investigation, grammarians have not reached a better understanding of what mood and modality in language are.

The English term '*mood*' has an interesting origin. As etymological dictionaries suggest, the common Germanic sense in the word *mood* is 'frame of mind' or 'individual disposition' [28, p. 41]. This sense is also present in the noun *mood* which is not a grammar term – as we say *I'm in a good mood*. In Germanic period '*mood*' in commonplace meaning and '*mood*' as a term from grammar were not differentiated from each other, and this early usage of the word *mood* can lead the researcher to come to the grip with this notion – it refers to the individual frame of mind every speaker has in any communicative situation [5, p. 154].

To continue, if comparing the English term '*mood*' with the Latin and French equivalents, Romanic languages have the words '*mode*' and '*modus*' used in the same way as the English term *mood*. The noun *mode* can be paraphrased in English as '*manner*' and the Latin *modus* is equal to English '*measure*' or '*manner*' as well. In English we also have word '*mode*' that most directly relates to grammar, as we can speak of distinction of forms of English verb. Yet '*mood*' came to be used in grammar for grammatical '*mode*'. As the Oxford English dictionary (henceforth OED) notes, it was '*reinforced by the association*' with the common Germanic meaning of '*mental state*' [OED]. It makes sense because the common noun *mood* requires the status of grammatical term due to the fact that some central modes of the verb are indicative, imperative and oblique – and these have long been related to mental states of individuals [27, p. 11].

Another reason why the word ‘mood’ successfully entered the grammar terms list is that the Middle English spelling ‘moode’ can be seen as the ancestor of both modern words ‘mood’ and ‘mode’. The oldest definitions of the words ‘mood’ and ‘mode’ in OED and Merriam-Webster dictionary (henceforth MW) are the same:

“A verbe [...] is declined wyth moode and tyme wyth oute case” (OED, entry *mood* and entry *mode*)”

Having two terms for one phenomenon is typical not only for English, but also for other Germanic and Romanic languages. In modern French, for example, there is just *mode*, though earlier there was also *moeuf*, which derived from *modus*. The word *modo*, again deriving from Latin ‘*modus*’, is used in Portuguese, Spanish and Italian. Germanic languages such as German, Norwegian, and Swedish use the Latin word ‘*modus*’ and if there is a second term, it tends to be a word that means ‘*manner*’ (Dutch, e.g., prefers *wijs* or *wijze*, a general ‘*manner*’ word).

The modern term ‘*modality*’ derives from the Latin word ‘*modalitas*’. This Latin word was very rare. The term ‘*modality*’ entered English from French ‘*modalité*’. In the early entry in the OED dating back 1545, it has the general meaning: ‘those aspects of a thing which relate to its mode’. The current linguistic use of the term ‘*modality*’ is relatively recent; it comes from 1907. But the linguistic sense at first related to logical and philosophical uses, which concern the treatment of the utterance as necessary or possible. For these senses the earliest OED entry dates from 1628.

In Germanic and Romanic languages, the term ‘*modality*’ is related to the term ‘*mood*’, in some other languages the equivalents of these two terms are unrelated where the term ‘*mood*’ is claimed to be the oldest. This is true about Greek where we have ‘*enklisi*’ (lit. ‘*inclination*’) for ‘*mood*’, but, for modality ‘*tropikotita*’ (lit. ‘*tropicality*’, based on *trópos*). It was the classical Greek source for one of the Latin *modus* senses [27, p. 59].

The category of mood is an explicit verbal category expressing the relation of the action denoted by the predicate to reality as stated by the speaker. It is one of the most important means of expressing modality [28].

Presumably, in modern English there are six moods:

- the Indicative mood
- the Imperative mood
- the Subjunctive I
- the Subjunctive II
- the Suppositional mood
- the Conditional mood [7]

The last four moods are called oblique.

When using the indicative mood, the speaker represents the action as really taking place, as a real fact. When the speaker uses the imperative mood, he/she directly induces the listener to do the action required. When he/she uses any of the oblique moods, he/she represents the action not as a real fact but only as desirable, necessary, possible, imaginary, etc. Let's consider them in detail.

The indicative mood is a grammatical form of the verb used to express statements, facts, beliefs, or questions that are objective or factual. It is the most common mood in most languages, including English. When a verb is in the indicative mood, it presents information or reality without any specific emphasis on doubt, uncertainty, command, or other subjective elements [7]. Here are characteristics of the indicative mood:

- ✓ Statements of fact

The indicative mood is used to make straightforward statements or convey objective information: *She is studying for her exams. The sun rises in the east.*

- ✓ Questions seeking information

Interrogative sentences that aim to gather factual information are also expressed in the indicative mood: *What time is it? Where is the nearest post office?*

- ✓ Statements of beliefs or opinions

The indicative mood is used to express personal beliefs or opinions as statements of fact: *I believe he will come. She thinks it's a great idea.*

- ✓ Timeless truths

The indicative mood is employed to convey general truths or universal facts: *Water boils at 100 degrees Celsius. The Earth revolves around the sun.*

- ✓ Statements of possibility or probability

The indicative mood can be used to express possibility or probability in a factual manner: *It may rain tomorrow. There is a chance of winning the lottery.* [3]

In contrast to the indicative mood, there are other moods such as the subjunctive mood, conditional mood, imperative mood, and others, which express different levels of uncertainty, conditionality, or subjective elements. The indicative mood, however, is primarily used to present statements of fact or objective information in a straightforward manner.

The imperative mood is a grammatical form used to express commands, requests, instructions, or suggestions. It is used when the speaker wants to direct or influence the actions of others. The imperative mood is primarily employed in the second person (*you*) or sometimes the first person plural (*we*) forms of the verb, as these are the forms commonly used to address others. Here are some functions of the imperative mood:

- ✓ Commands

The imperative mood is used to give direct commands or orders: *Close the door. Sit down. Please be quiet.*

- ✓ Requests

It is also used to make polite requests: *Please pass me the salt. Help me with this. Could you turn off the lights?*

- ✓ Instructions

The imperative mood is employed to provide step-by-step instructions: *Mix the ingredients well. Stir the soup gently. Press the button to start.*

- ✓ Suggestions

It can be used to give suggestions or advice: *Try the seafood pasta. Take a break and relax. Don't forget to bring an umbrella.*

In the imperative mood, the subject is usually omitted, as the command or request is directed at the listener. For example: *Open the window* (You open the

window) or *Let's go* (Let us go). It's important to note that the imperative mood typically does not indicate tense, as the focus is on giving instructions or commands rather than specifying when the action should occur [21]. However, the context and adverbs of time can be used to add temporal information if necessary.

In addition to the second person and first person plural forms, the imperative mood can also be used with "let's" to form a suggestion or invitation directed at a group that includes the speaker. For example: *Let's go for a walk* or *Let's have dinner together*.

The imperative mood is a powerful tool for issuing commands, making requests, giving instructions, or providing suggestions in a direct and influential manner.

There exist different approaches to explaining the number of moods in English. This question is one of the most controversial problems in English grammar. There is only one point clear – there are at least two moods in English, one of them being the Indicative mood. But a great variety of views is observed as to the number of oblique moods, their meanings and functions. Some linguists suggest that there may be 16 moods, while others claim that there are no oblique moods at all, only the Indicative and the Imperative ones [27].

Such a controversy of views and opinions on the number and the very essence of the modern English of oblique moods is caused on the one hand by the fact that there is no direct correspondence between the form and the meaning of the oblique mood forms. In fact, the same grammatical form may render different meanings. Let's compare the following sentences:

1. It's necessary that you should go there tomorrow.
2. If I knew about it, I should go there tomorrow.
3. I should go there tomorrow.
4. I must go there tomorrow.

On the other hand, the same meaning may be rendered by different grammatical forms:

It is necessary that you should go there.

It is necessary that you go there.

That is why depending upon what criterion a linguist takes as a basis or starting point for his classification of moods he or she will arrive at different results. Evidently, some scholars took the criterion of form as the basis of the classifications, while others consider both form and meaning of the predicate.

2.2 Modal verbs

Modal verbs are a category of auxiliary verbs that express modality, which refers to the speaker's attitude or the likelihood of the action or state described by the main verb. Modal verbs modify the meaning of the main verb and indicate various modalities such as possibility, necessity, ability, permission, and obligation. Some common modal verbs in English include "can," "could," "may," "might," "must," "shall," "should," "will," "would," and "ought to." It's worth noting that modal verbs and other expressions of modality can vary in usage and meaning depending on the context, tense, and speaker's intention. Let's start our analysis with the modal verbs.

2.2.1 Can

The verb '*can*' has the following meanings: ability (physical, mental, circumstantial), permission, request, prohibition, improbability, uncertainty, doubt [16]. Let's consider them in detail.

1) Ability to do something.

The ability can be physical, mental or circumstantial. In this meaning, it has the following forms: '*can*' is used in the present tense, and '*could*' in the past tense, for example:

For employees, it offers more flexibility than full-time in the office and means they can work safely during the pandemic [43]. (here we refer to the ability in the present)

Even before the pandemic, this could be a difficult position to be in: they (middle managers) historically ranked among the least happy in the workforce [45]. (here we refer to the ability in the past)

The form ‘*could*’ is used in two ways: first, we can use it in past-time contexts as a form of the Indicative mood, for example: *After that we could see more companies follow suit, say some experts, including Jason Schloetzer, associate professor at McDonough School of Business, Georgetown University, US, who says full remote "is the direction some companies seem to be going" [48].* And secondly, we use ‘*could*’ in present-time contexts as a form of the oblique mood to express unreality, for example: *However, if workers are allowed a degree of choice and control over their working patterns, the rewards could pay dividends [46].*

In combination with the perfect infinitive ‘*could*’ indicates that the action was not carried out in the past. For example:

You could have seen a positive impact if it hadn't been so weird [56].

The modal verb ‘*can*’ has the substitute ‘*be able to*’. In the present tense, ‘*can*’ and ‘*be able to*’ are interchangeable, but ‘*can*’ is more usual. In the past tense, we use ‘*could*’ to say that someone had the general ability to do something [16]. For example:

I don't think this move is non-reversible – they could just go back into the cities and buy real estate [57]. (the general ability)

If we mean that someone managed to do something in a particular situation, we use ‘*was / were able to*’ do something, but we don’t use ‘*could*’.

e.g. *This is especially jarring for workers who were able to save during remote work, when these expenditures weren't a factor. [50]*

The negative ‘*could not*’ is possible in all situations. We can say:

When he began searching for a long-term apartment he found the process wasn't nearly as easy as he expected, with complicated legal procedures, and a multi-month timeline he couldn't manage. [51]

We tried hard by we couldn't persuade them to come along with. [48]

We also use ‘*could*’ in all situations – of the general ability and in a particular situation – with the verbs of sense perception. For example:

When he entered the kitchen he could smell gas.

In the future tense, both ‘*can*’ and ‘*will be able to*’ are used; however, the latter is preferable when the speaker wants to stress that the action refers to the future:

He adds that the economy can also play a role in keeping unhappy workers in their jobs in the future. [51]

Compton says she’s hopeful she and her family will be able to make their home in Larkhill, north of Salisbury, a more permanent base after years moving around. [58]

The substitute ‘*be able to*’ is found in cases when we use another modal verb or non-finite form of the verb. It is also used in cases of tense forms that the modal verb ‘*can*’ has not.

*Nobody else has been able to read this [47]. (in this case, ‘*can*’ has no perfect form)*

We might not be able to offer them a place to enjoy all the benefits an office brings. [43]

*You are foolish to expect to be able to convince her if she set her mind against this. (the modal ‘*can*’ has no infinitive form)*

*I couldn’t describe my satisfaction of being able to do this job. (the modal ‘*can*’ has no gerund form) [49]*

2) Permission, request, asking for permission, or prohibition.

The verb ‘*can*’ expressing permission is found in the affirmative sentences:

e.g. *You can use my car in my absence.*

The verb ‘*can*’ expressing request or asking for permission is found in the interrogative sentences, for example:

Can you tell me the time?

Can I have another piece of cake? [3]

To make the request or asking for permission more polite, the form ‘*could*’ with reference to the present is used:

Could you give me a lift?

Could I use your car in your absence?

The verb ‘*can*’ expressing prohibition is used in the negative sentences:

“To be a digital nomad, you need to have tremendous freedom – you need to have a good passport, you can’t have a criminal record, you can’t have too much debt,” says Beverly Yuen Thompson, associate professor of sociology at Siena College, New York, who studies digital nomads. [60]

The form ‘*could*’ is used in indirect speech according to the rules of the sequence of tenses:

He said I could use his car in his absence.

I asked him if he could give me a lift. [3]

3) *Improbability, uncertainty, doubt.*

In this meaning, the verb ‘*can*’ is found in the interrogative sentences in general questions and in the negative sentences. Depending on the time reference, ‘*can*’ in this meaning is used in combination with different forms of infinitive. If reference is made to the present, the non-perfect or continuous infinitive is used [16]:

e.g. John can’t be really ill.

Can he be making the investigation all alone?

‘*Can*’ in combination with the perfect infinitive or the perfect continuous infinitive refers the action to the past:

Jane can’t have told a lie. She’s a trustworthy person.

Can you have been waiting for this opportunity so long? [61]

‘*Could*’ is used instead of ‘*can*’ to imply greater uncertainty:

Could it be so late? [49]

She couldn’t have been at home at this time.

Can she doubt my word?

Can he have missed the train?

Could they have been working in the in the office for eight hours?

Ann can't be so selfish.

He can't be playing tennis hour.

They can't have been mistaken.

They can't have been talking all evening.

To express the doubt about a situation not taking place, we use the verb 'fail' and the antonym of the notional verb:

Could he have failed to inform you about the changes in our time table?

He couldn't have misunderstood you. [3]

4) Impatience, puzzlement, or other emotions.

The verb 'can' is used in special questions to make them more emotional – to express puzzlement, impatience etc.

Which of the children could have broken the window?

Who could have thought that he would not come?

Where can I have seen him?

What can he be doing now?

How could he have forgotten my address? [3]

The modal verb 'can' is used in the following **set phrases**: [16]

- 'can't help doing something' means can't avoid or prevent doing something:

I can't help thinking he still here.

The joke was so funny that we could not helping all the Time.

- 'can't but do something' means must. It is used in formal speech.

One cannot but admire her even if one may not like her.

- 'can't possibly do something' means it's possible:

You can't possibly work when 20 miles an hour.

He was so insistent I couldn't possibly refuse him. [3]

2.2.2 May

The modal verb 'may' has the following meanings: permission, asking for permission, prohibition, possibility, disapproval and supposition implying uncertainty [15].

1) *Permission, asking for permission, prohibition.*

In this meaning, the verb 'may' has two tense forms of the Indicative mood – the present tense 'may' and the past tense 'might'. The latter is used in indirect speech [16], as the following examples demonstrate:

You may smoke in here.

The manager said that I might leave the office 10 minutes earlier. [49]

The verb 'may' expressing permission is used in affirmative sentences.

You may tell you friend everything. [61]

In interrogative sentences it expresses request. Both 'may' and 'might' are used for request with reference to the present or the future, 'might' expressing a politer request.

May ask you a question?

Might I come tomorrow?

In negative sentences, the verb 'may' is used to express prohibition. But it is not very common to express prohibition by 'may', other modal verbs are more common in this meaning, such as 'can' and 'must.'

e.g. *You may not go out you've got cold.*

In these meanings, both 'can' and 'may' are used. The verb 'can' is used more often in colloquial speech:

You may leave when you finish. You can take a day off whenever you want.

2) *Possibility due to circumstances.*

In this meaning, the modal 'may' occurs only in the affirmative sentences and it is followed by the non-perfect infinitive [15]:

e.g. *You may order a taxi in the app. [60]*

The form 'might' is used in past-time contexts according to the rules of the sequence of tenses:

e.g. *He said he might order a taxi in the app.*

'*Might*' followed by the perfect infinitive expresses unreality – so this is the oblique mood. This is clear in the following example:

Luckily, John wasn't driving a car. If he had, he might have been hurt.

Both '*could*' and '*might*' when followed by the perfect infinitive are used to say that something was possible in the past but didn't happen, as the following example shows:

He was absolutely stupid to try to climb that tree – he might have killed himself.

I forgot to lock my car last night. You were lucky, someone could have stolen it. [15]

3) *Disapproval, reproach.*

Here we find only the form '*might*' used in the affirmative sentences and followed by the non-perfect of perfect infinitive. [15]

You might be more polite to her.

You might tell let me know about it beforehand.

4) *Supposition implying uncertainty.*

In this meaning, '*may*' can be followed by different forms of the infinitive depending on the time reference expressed. '*May*' in combination with the non-perfect or continuous infinitive refers the sentence to the present or to the future.

He may come soon. (future)

It is too late to phone him now; he may be sleeping. (present moment)

'*May*' in combination with the perfect infinitive refers the action to the past:
e.g. *He may have forgotten your request.*

The form '*might*' is also used in this meaning. It is used to emphasize the idea of uncertainty. The following examples demonstrate this.

You had to re-think recruiting processes: hiring a worker that you might never meet in person. [50]

He might have spoken to her yesterday.

The modal verb '*may*' is used in the following ***set phrases***:

- ‘*might as well*’ or ‘*may as well*’ or ‘*might just as well*’ with the infinitive – it is a very mild way of expressing an intention. We use it to say that we should do something but only because there is no reason not to do it, and because there is nothing better to do. In such a way, a sentence ‘*We might as well watch this film.*’ means ‘why not watching it, there is nothing better to do.’ One more examples:

You have to wait an hour for the next train, so you might as well walk.

We may as well go to the party. We've got nothing else to do.

- ‘*if I may say so*’ has become a stereotype phrase in which the meaning of permission is considerably weakened: *If I may say so, I think you have treated him very badly.* [15; 16]

2.2.3 Must

The modal verb ‘*must*’ has the following meanings: obligation, duty, necessity, prohibition, strong advice, supposition implying assurance [15].

1) *Obligation, duty, necessity.*

In this meaning, the verb ‘*must*’ is found in the affirmative and interrogative sentences and is followed by the non-perfect infinitive.

The verb ‘*must*’ has only one form which is used with reference to the present or future:

You must talk to your daughter about her future.

Must you leave tomorrow?

It may be also used with reference to the past in indirect speech: *He said he must park here.*

In simple sentences and in main clauses of complex sentences the substitute ‘*had to*’ is used with reference to the past: *The children had to get up as it was already eight o'clock.*

The substitute ‘*have to*’ may be used with the reference to the present or future and also in cases of tense forms that the modal verb ‘*must*’ has not, including non-finite forms of the verbs [14]. Let’s consider some examples:

In spring we have to work in the garden every day.

You will have to come back home tomorrow.

I have had to remind you of phoning or messaging to her all the time.

It wouldn't have been very nice for you to have to mix with all those people there.

Having to work alone, he wanted all his time for his research.

The interrogative and the negative forms are formed like those of a regular verb – in accordance with the general rules.

Did Mom have to work late yesterday?

You don't have to tell me if you don't want to.

He won't have to come back to September, will he?

There is sometimes a difference between the verb 'must' and its substitute 'have to' referring to the present. With 'must' the speaker is expressing his own feelings about the necessity:

I must write to her – I haven't written to her for ages (the speaker personally feels that he must write to her, no one induces him to do so).

The government must really do something about unemployment (the speaker personally feels that the government must do something about this issue)

With 'have to' the speaker expresses circumstantial necessity without giving his/her own feelings or attitudes:

Her eyes are not very good – she has to wear glasses for reading.

I can't meet you on Friday. I have to work.

With reference to the future 'must' and 'have to' may be used interchangeably.

e. g. I must buy a new laptop. I will have to buy a new laptop.

However, the verb 'have to' is preferred to express circumstantial necessity:

You'll have to get up early when you start work, won't you?

'Mustn't' and 'don't have to' are completely different in their meaning and function. 'You mustn't do something' means it's necessary that you do not do it:

You mustn't tell anyone what I said (it means 'don't tell anyone').

I promised to be on time. I mustn't be late (= I must be on time).

‘You don't have to do something’ means it's not necessary to do it, you don't need to do it [15]. For example:

I don't have to wear a suit to work but I usually do.

She stayed in bed this morning because she didn't have to go to work.

We can use ‘have got to’ instead of ‘have to’:

The kids have got to stay here till 2.

Have you got to get up early?

The absence of necessity is expressed by the modal verb ‘need’ in negative sentences: *You need not worry so much about it.*

In combination with the perfect infinitive the verb ‘need’ expresses an action which has been performed, though it was unnecessary. It implies a waste of time or effort. For example: *You need not have hurried there is plenty of time.*

There is another substitute of ‘must’ – ‘**to be to**’. It is used to express

- a) orders or instructions

He is to stay here till we return.

- b) a planned or previously arranged action

The prime minister is to make a statement tomorrow.

They were to stop for lunch in the next town.

The perfect infinitive after ‘be to’ is used to indicate that the planned action was not carried out.

William was to have arrived an hour ago, but he missed the four o'clock train.

- c) something that is destined to happen

They said goodbye, a little knowing that they were never to meet again.

This use is limited to narration.

- d) possibility (with the passive infinitive)

Nothing was to be done under the circumstances.

In this meaning, ‘be to’ is equivalent to ‘can’ or ‘may’. [15]

2) **Prohibition.**

In this meaning, the verb ‘must’ is used in the negative sentences and is followed by the non-perfect infinitive. For example:

You mustn't drive so fast.

3) **Strong advice.**

This meaning is found in the affirmative and negative sentences and it is closely connected with the two meanings mentioned above.

You mustn't miss the film. It's worth seeing.

4) **Supposition implying assurance.**

In this meaning, 'must' can be followed by all forms of the infinitive. When reference is made to the present, the non-perfect or continuous infinitive is used:

He must know all about it, he has read a lot on the subject.

Tommy must be playing in the park.

With reference to the past the perfect or perfect continuous infinitive is used.

Someone must have pointed out the optics – they've had their cameras off in the last few meetings. [56]

It must have been raining all the night.

She must be about 20. She went to school with his sister.

Something must have happened. He has never been late before. [60]

She must have been waiting for an hour.

The modal verb 'must' in this meaning is not used with reference to the future. In this case we use modal words 'probably' and 'evidently'. For example: *David will probably come tomorrow.*

Also, the modal 'must' is not used in the interrogative or negative form. To express supposition implying assurance with negative meaning, in addition to the modal words ('probably', 'evidently') the following means are used: the verb 'fail', the adverb 'never' or antonyms of the notional verbs.

John must have failed to get in touch with her.

She must never have guessed the truth.

Probably Jane didn't notice you.

They must be unaware of the fact.

The modal verb 'must' is used in the following **set phrases**:

- 'must needs' denotes obligation.

- ‘I must tell you’, ‘I must say’ are stereotyped phrases in which the meaning of obligation is considerably weakened.
- In the sentences like ‘you must come and see me some time’, ‘you must have dinner with me’ the verb ‘must’ is also used with weakened meaning, it has become part of such sentences which are a common way of expressing invitations.
- ‘Must’ may also indicate the occurrence of something unwelcome, something contrary to what was wanted:

He must come and worry here with his silly questions just when she was busy cooking the dinner.

I must be going and I must be of both mean it's time for me to go.

2.2.4 Should and ought to

The modal verbs ‘*should*’ and ‘*ought to*’ have the following meanings: obligation, advisability, desirability, supposition, probability.

1) *Obligation.*

In different contexts, it may acquire additional shades of meaning, such as advisability and desirability. The verbs ‘*should*’ and ‘*ought to*’ are used with the indefinite or continuous infinitive when referring the action to the present or future [5]. Let’s consider the following examples:

You shouldn't miss this opportunity. [61]

You ought to say a word or two about yourself.

You shouldn't be sitting in the sun. Move out of it into the shade.

At your age, you should be earning your living.

‘Should’ and ‘ought to’ may be used with the perfect or perfect continuous infinitive. In the affirmative form, the combination shows that a desirable action was not fulfilled.

He looks very ill. He should have stayed at home.

You ought to have chosen a more suitable time to tell me this news.

In the negative form, the combination shows that an undesirable action was fulfilled [1].

They shouldn't have concealed it from us.

You ought not to have married her. It was a great mistake.

2) Supposition implying strong probability.

The modal verbs 'should' and 'ought to' are usually used to express something naturally expected.

The film should be very good as it is an all-star film.

As strong wind is blowing, it ought to bring a change of weather.

The use of 'should' and 'ought to' is not very common, as this meaning is commonly rendered by the verb 'must'. [1]

3) The emotional 'should'.

The modal verb 'should' may have a specific function – it may be used to express surprise, indignation, disappointment, joy etc. In this function, it is called 'the emotional should'. It is used in special emphatic constructions beginning with 'why'. For example:

Why should I be frightened?

I don't see why we shouldn't make friends.

I don't see any reason why he shouldn't be happy.

The emotional 'should' may be followed by the perfect infinitive. In simple sentences it refers the action to the past, in complex sentences it shows that the action of the subordinate clause precedes that of the principle clause [15].

I went into business with her as her partner. Why shouldn't I have done it?

He didn't know why he should have expected them to look different.

There was no reason why she should have felt it necessary to lie to me.

2.2.5 Shall and will

The modal verb 'shall' has the following meanings: asking for instruction and certainty.

1) Asking for instruction.

In this meaning, it is used in the interrogative form with the first person, but sometimes with the third person as well. It is always used with reference to the future:

Shall I get you some coffee?

Shall we have breakfast in bed?

2) Certainty.

Depending on the context, the modal verb 'shall' denotes promise, threat, command, or warning. It is used in the affirmative form with the second and third persons [16]. For example:

You shall have my answer tomorrow.

You shall stay just where you are.

If you don't listen to your boss, you shall not have your job much longer.

It is also used in formal or even archaic style in legal documents:

This book shall not be lent, sold, or published without the publisher's consent.

The modal verb 'will' has the following meanings: intention, determination, resistance, refusal, request, supposition.

1) Intention, determination.

In this meaning, it has two forms will for the present tense, and would for the past tense. It is often pronounced with the emphatic stress.

I will get the main part in this play. I said I would do anything for him.

2) Resistance, refusal to perform an action in the present or past.

In this meaning, it is used in the negative sentences.

He won't listen to reason.

Though we always invited him, he wouldn't come.

In this meaning 'will' or 'would' can be used when the subject is an inanimate thing:

The window won't open.

I asked him to lend me some money because I needed it.

3) Polite request.

Both ‘*will*’ and ‘*would*’ are used in this meaning with reference to the future, but ‘*would*’ is more polite.

Will you bring me a glass of water?

Won't you sit down for a moment?

In this meaning, it may be used in adverbial clauses of condition introduced by the conjunction *if*.

If you will wait for a moment, I will find the book.

If you would stand by me, I should have another try.

4) Supposition.

In this meaning, ‘*will*’ is used with the non-perfect infinitive with reference to the present or future in combination with the perfect infinitive with reference to the past. For example:

This will be the school, I believe.

You will have heard the news, I'm sure.

This meaning is found with the second and third persons. It should be noted that the use of ‘*will*’ in this meaning is not common.

‘*Will*’ or ‘*would*’ maybe used in the following **set phrases**:

- ‘*would rather*’ and ‘*would sooner*’ – it means to prefer, e.g. *I would rather tell him all myself.*

He would sooner go hungry than admit he has no money.

- ‘*would you mind*’ in the interrogative sentences expresses a polite request or invitation.

Would do you mind bringing my handbag, please?

Would you mind eating out with me today?

- The specific use of *will* in the following sentences:

‘Boys will be boys’ means we cannot expect them to behave except as boys naturally do.

‘Accidents will happen’ means they are to be expected from time to time.

2.3 Other lexical ways of expressing modality

In addition to modal verbs, there are other lexical ways to express modality in English. These include: semi-modal verbs, modal adverbs and adverbial phrases, modal adjectives, modal nouns and modal expressions [15; 16].

Semi-modal verbs, also known as *quasi-modal verbs* or *marginal modal verbs*, are a group of verbs that have some characteristics of both modal verbs and ordinary lexical verbs. While they share similarities with modal verbs in terms of their functions and meanings, they also possess certain characteristics that set them apart [1]. Here are some examples of semi-modal verbs:

Used to: it expresses past habits or states. It is similar to the modal verb 'would' when used in this context. For example:

I used to play the piano when I was younger.

Ought to: this verb expresses moral obligation, and it is similar to 'should':

You ought to apologize for what you said.

Had better: it is used to give strong advice or warn about a potential consequence. It has a sense of urgency and is similar to 'should'. For example:

You had better leave now; otherwise, you'll miss your flight.

Need to: "Need to" expresses necessity or obligation, similar to the modal verb "must." For instance, *You need to finish your homework before going out.*

Used as: "Used as" is used to describe the purpose or function of something. It is similar to "can be used as." For example, *Paper clips can be used as makeshift hooks.* [3]

These semi-modal verbs can often be used interchangeably with their corresponding modal verbs but may also have subtle differences in meaning or usage. They share some characteristics of modal verbs, such as the absence of an auxiliary verb in questions and negatives and the ability to convey similar functions, but they also function as regular verbs in other aspects, such as their ability to inflect for tense and number.

Modal adverbs and adverbial phrases are adverbs or groups of words that modify the action or verb in a sentence and express the speaker's attitude, perspective, or manner in relation to that action. They often convey the speaker's

opinion, judgment, certainty, doubt, or evaluation [7]. Here are some examples of modal adverbs and adverbial phrases:

Definitely expresses a strong affirmation or certainty. For example, *He is definitely coming to the party.*

Probably indicates a high likelihood or probability. For instance, *She will probably arrive late.*

Certainly conveys strong assurance or conviction. For example, *I will certainly be there to support you.*

Possibly implies a potential or hypothetical situation. E.g., *He could possibly win the competition.*

Perhaps indicates uncertainty or a suggestion. For example: *Perhaps we should consider other options.*

Clearly conveys that something is evident or obvious. For instance, *He clearly understood the instructions.*

Obviously indicates that something is readily apparent or easy to understand. For example: *She was obviously upset by the news.*

Presumably implies a reasonable assumption or inference. For instance: *He is late; presumably, there was traffic.*

Allegedly indicates that something is claimed to be true but may be disputed or unproven. For example: *The suspect allegedly committed the crime.* [13]

Modal adverbs and adverbial phrases can provide additional information and context to the action or verb in a sentence, allowing the speaker to express their viewpoint or perspective. They help convey nuances and shades of meaning, indicating the speaker's level of certainty, doubt, expectation, or evaluation regarding the action described.

Modal adjectives typically describe characteristics or qualities related to possibility, necessity, ability, or similar concepts. While they are not specifically labeled as modal adjectives, their usage can have a modal-like effect in a sentence. Here are a few examples:

Possible indicates that something can happen or be done. For example: *It is possible to complete the project within the given timeframe.*

Necessary conveys that something is required or essential. For instance: *It is necessary to bring your identification documents for the interview.*

Able describes the capability or capacity to do something: *She is able to solve complex mathematical problems.*

Impossible indicates that something cannot occur or be achieved: *It is impossible to travel faster than the speed of light.*

Essential conveys that something is crucial or fundamental: *Good communication skills are essential for success in the workplace.* [5]

These adjectives are not inherently modal in nature, but when used in specific contexts or alongside verbs expressing modality, they can contribute to the overall expression of modality within a sentence.

Modal nouns: Nouns that convey modality, like "ability," "permission," "obligation," "likelihood," etc.

Modal expressions: Phrases or idiomatic expressions that convey modality, such as "had better," "would rather," "be supposed to," "be able to," "be allowed to," etc. [21]

It's worth noting that modal verbs and other expressions of modality can vary in usage and meaning depending on the context, tense, and speaker's intention.

Conclusion on part 2

Modal verbs are a category of verbs that are used to express various functions and attitudes in a sentence. The most common are the following:

Ability: Modal verbs can express the ability or inability to do something. For example, 'can' indicates capability, such as *I can swim*, while 'cannot' or 'can't' expresses incapability, as in *I can't swim*.

Permission: Modal verbs can indicate permission or the lack thereof. For instance, 'may' is used to ask for or grant permission, like *May I go to the party?* Similarly, 'can' can also be used to seek permission, as in *Can I borrow your pen?*

Obligation: Modal verbs express obligations or duties. ‘Must’ signifies a strong obligation or necessity, as in *You must complete the assignment*. ‘Should’ implies a recommendation or moral obligation, such as *You should apologize for your mistake*.

Prohibition: Modal verbs can express prohibition or the act of forbidding something. "Must not" or "mustn't" indicates a strong prohibition, for example, *You mustn't smoke in here*. ‘Should not’ or ‘shouldn’t’ suggests an advisability against an action, as in *You shouldn't eat too much sugar*.

Supposition: Modal verbs can be used to make deductions or draw conclusions based on evidence or probability. "Must" indicates a high degree of certainty, like *She must be tired; she worked all day*. "Might" or "may" expresses possibility or uncertainty, for instance, *It might rain tomorrow*.

Advice: Modal verbs can provide advice or suggestions. "Should" is commonly used to offer advice, as in *You should exercise regularly for better health*.

Requests: Modal verbs can be employed to make requests or ask for something. "Could" is often used to make polite requests, such as *Could you pass me the salt, please?*

Future actions: Modal verbs can indicate future actions. "Will" and "shall" are used to express future intentions or predictions, such as *I will see you tomorrow*.

Ability in the past: "Could," "was/were able to," and "managed to" can express ability in the past. For example, *She could swim when she was five*.

Modal verbs have different forms, such as *can, could, may, might, must, shall, should, will, would, ought to*, etc., and their usage can vary depending on the context and tense of the sentence.

CONCLUSIONS

The thesis discusses expression of modality in English. Modality refers to the grammatical and semantic expression of possibility, necessity, ability, permission, and other related concepts in a language. It helps to convey the speaker’s attitude or stance towards the proposition expressed in a sentence / utterance.

The early approaches to modality primarily focused on the grammatical and syntactic aspects, often centering on the traditional modal verbs such as *can*, *could*, *may*, and *must*. Scholars sought to establish a set of rules governing the usage of modal verbs, categorizing them based on their epistemic and deontic meanings. These early frameworks provided a solid foundation for subsequent research, paving the way for deeper investigations into the conceptual and cognitive dimensions of modality.

The advent of modern linguistic theories, particularly cognitive linguistics and discourse studies, brought about a paradigm shift in the study of modality. Rather than viewing modality as a rigid grammatical category, modern approaches recognize its inseparable connection with human cognition and conceptualization. Scholars now explore the cognitive and semantic underpinnings of modality, emphasizing the subjective nature of modal expressions and their role in shaping a speaker's perspective on events and states.

Within the realm of modern approaches, various types of modality have been identified and classified. Epistemic modality refers to the speaker's assessment of the likelihood or truth value of a proposition, expressing notions of possibility, probability, certainty, or uncertainty. Deontic modality, on the other hand, deals with the speaker's evaluation of necessity, obligation, permission, or prohibition, relating to normative or moral judgments. These two primary types of modality have been extensively studied and serve as fundamental building blocks for understanding how speakers convey their attitudes, beliefs, and judgments in language. Beyond epistemic and deontic modality, additional types have been identified, expanding the scope of research in this area. Evaluative modality encompasses modal expressions that convey the speaker's subjective evaluation or appraisal of a situation or entity.

By exploring these different types of modality, researchers gain a more comprehensive understanding of the diverse ways in which speakers express their perspectives and navigate linguistic choices. This knowledge contributes not only to linguistic theories but also to practical applications such as language teaching, translation, and intercultural communication.

The theoretical foundations of studying modality have evolved significantly over time. From a focus on grammatical rules and categorization, we have transitioned to a deeper understanding of modality as a cognitive and conceptual phenomenon. The identification and classification of various types of modality have enriched our comprehension of how speakers employ language to convey nuanced meanings and negotiate their subjective stance in discourse.

As a result of practical research we've come to the following. Modal verbs and moods of verbs uncover the intricate ways in which these linguistic devices contribute to the expression of modality in language.

The examination of moods of verbs has revealed the discursive aspects of modality, shedding light on how speakers negotiate their stance, authority, and interpersonal relationships in communication. The indicative mood, for instance, conveys factual statements or objective descriptions, while the subjunctive mood brings forth hypothetical or counterfactual situations. By employing these different moods, speakers can assert their beliefs, express doubt, make suggestions, or impose obligations in a given discourse context.

The interplay between cognitive structures and discursive functions becomes evident as we observe the dynamic nature of modality in language use. Speakers employ modal verbs and moods of verbs strategically to shape their discourse, influence the perceptions of their interlocutors, and convey their subjective attitudes towards the proposition being discussed. Whether it is the use of modal verbs to express permission or the selection of a specific mood to convey a subtle evaluative stance, modality plays a central role in constructing meaning and facilitating effective communication.

Ultimately, this research illuminates the significance of studying various aspects of modality, highlighting the dynamic role that modal verbs and moods of verbs play in shaping meaning, negotiating interpersonal relationships, and conveying subjective perspectives.

The prospects for further research are in unraveling the intricate workings of modality in different discourse types to enhance our understanding of human communication and pave the way for practical applications in fields such as language teaching, translation, and cross-cultural interactions.

REFERENCES

1. Achard M. *Representation of cognitive structures: Syntax and semantics of French sentential complements*. 1998. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 320 p.
2. Alonso-Ovalle L., Menéndez–Benito P. ‘Epistemic indefinites: An overview.’ In *Epistemic Indefinites: Exploring Modality Beyond the Verbal Domain* / eds. Alonso-Ovalle L., Menéndez–Benito P. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2015. P 1–27.
3. Biber D. et al. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow, Essex: Pearson Education Ltd. 1999. 450 p.
4. Bybee J.L., Perkins D., Pagliuca W. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect, and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press. 1994.
5. Carrió Pastor M.L. Cross-cultural variation in the use of modal verbs in academic English. *Sky Journal of Linguistics*. 2014. Vol. 27, Issue 1. P. 153-166.
6. Chrisman M. Deontic modals. In: *Routledge Encyclopedia of Philosophy*. 2015. Taylor and Francis.
7. Cornillie B., Pietrandrea P. *Modality at work. Cognitive, interactional and textual functions of modal markers*. 2012. hal-00665337
8. Depraetere I., Reed S. ‘Towards a more explicit taxonomy of root possibility.’ *English Language and Linguistics*, 2011. Volume 15, Issue 1. P. 1-29.
9. Egan A., Weatherson B. ‘Introduction: Epistemic modals and epistemic modality.’ In *Epistemic Modality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2011
10. Goldberg A. E. *Constructions at Work: The Nature of Generalization in Language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2006.
11. Langacker R.W. ‘Modals: Striving for control.’ In *English Modality: Core, Periphery and Evidentiality* / Eds. Marín-Arrese J. I., Carretero M., Hita J. A., van der Auwera J. Berlin/Boston: DeGruyter Mouton, 2013. P. 3-56.
12. Nordquist R. Modality (Grammar and Semantics). *ThoughtCo*, Aug. 26, 2020, [thoughtco.com/modality-grammar-and-semantics-1691396](https://www.thoughtco.com/modality-grammar-and-semantics-1691396) .

13. Nuyts J. *Epistemic modality, language and conceptualization: A cognitive-pragmatic perspective*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 2001. 456 p.
14. Palmer, Frank R. *Mood and modality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1986. 268 p.
15. Pelyvás, Péter. 2000. Metaphorical extension of ‘*may*’ and ‘*must*’ into the epistemic domain. In *Metaphor and metonymy at the crossroads: A cognitive perspective* / Ed. Antonio Barcelona. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 2000. P. 233-250.
16. Quirk R., Greenbaum S., Leech G., Svartvik, J. A *Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman. 1985.
17. Sanders J., Spooren W. Subjectivity and certainty in epistemic modality: A study of Dutch epistemic modifiers. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 1996. Vol. 7. P. 241-264.
18. Schegloff E.A. On possibles. *Discourse studies*, 2008. Vol. 8, Issue 1. P. 141-157.
19. Simon-Vandenberghe A.-M. Aijmer K. *The Semantic Field of Modal Certainty. A Corpus-Based Study of English Adverbs*. Berlin - New York: Mouton de Gruyter. 2007.
20. Sweetser E. Root and epistemic modals: Causality in two worlds. *Berkeley Linguistics Society* 1982. Vol. 8. P. 484-507.
21. Sweetser E. From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure. *Cambridge Studies in Linguistics* 54. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. 1990.
22. Suikkanen J. Deontic Modality. *Analysis*. Volume 78, Issue 2. 2018. P. 354–363.
23. Talmy G. Irrealis and the subjunctive. *Studies in Language*, 1994. Vol. 18. P. 265–337.
24. Torres–Martínez S. Taming English modals. How a Construction Grammar approach helps to understand modal verbs. *English Today*, Volume 35, Issue 2, 2019. P. 50-57.

25. Traugott E.C. On the rise of epistemic meanings in English: An example of subjectification in semantic change. *Language*, 1989. Vol. 65. P. 31–55.
26. Traugott E.C. Subjectification in grammaticalisation. In *Subjectivity and subjectivisation: Linguistic perspectives* / Eds. Dieter Stein and Susan Wright. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1995. P. 31–54.
27. van der Auwera J., Dendale P. Modal Verbs in Germanic and Romance Languages. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*. 2001. Vol. 14. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.
28. Werner A. *Modality in Syntax, Semantics and Pragmatics*. 2021. 360 p.
29. Wierzbicka A. The semantics of modality. *Folia Linguistica*, 1987. Vol. 21. P. 25-43.
30. Wierzbicka A. *The semantics of grammar*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 1988. 230 p.
31. Барміна Є.О. Модальність як перекладознавча проблема. *Проблеми семантики, прагматики та когнітивної лінгвістики*, 2010. № 17. С. 27-35.
32. Гришина Є.А. Функціонування модальних дієслів на позначення припущення: гендерний аспект. *Studia Philologica* : зб. наук. пр. Рівнен. держ. гуманітар. ун-т. Рівне: РДГУ, 2018. Вип. 2. С. 97-101.
33. Гришина О.Д., Статкевич Л.П. Способи вираження модальності в англійській та українській мовах. *Вчені записки ТНУ імені В. І. Вернадського*. Серія: Філологія. Соціальні комунікації. Том 31 (70), № 4, Ч. 2. 2020. С. 40-46.
34. Голубенко Н. Когнітивно-дискурсивні особливості функціонування лексичних засобів вираження модальності в інтерсеміотичному перекладі. *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук*. Вип. 51, 2022. С. 250-254.
35. Дуніна К.І. *Репрезентація модальності в англійській мові*. Дис. на д.ф.н., Сумський державний університет. Суми: 2013. 480 с.
36. Ковбаско Ю.Г. Кореляція категорій модальності та дейксису у процесі формування «загального» значення лексичних одиниць в сучасній англійській мові. *Одеський лінгвістичний вісник*, 2016. Вип. 1 (7). С. 60-63.

37. Михайленко В. Дискурсивний аспект оператора модальності *must*. *Наукові записки*. Випуск 89 (5). Серія: Філологічні науки (мовознавство). Кіровоград: РВВ КДПУ ім. В. Винниченка, 2010. С. 150-154.

38. Постоленко І.С. Види модальності в англійській мові. *Професійна комунікація: мова і культура*: збірник матеріалів III Всеукраїнського науково-практичного вебінару (23 листопада 2016 р.).

39. Романенко А. М. Засоби вираження модальності в англійській мові XVI-XVII ст. *Сучасні напрямки досліджень міжкультурної комунікації та методики викладання іноземних мов*: Збірник наукових праць. 2011. С. 301-303.

40. Сушкевич О. Аксіологічна модальність фінальної фази інтерв'ю в українській та англійській мовах. *Наукові записки*. Випуск 96 (1). Серія: Філологічні науки (мовознавство): У 2 ч. Кіровоград: РВВ КДПУ ім. В. Винниченка, 2011. 610 с.

41. Ткачук В.М. (2003). *Категорія суб'єктивної модальності*. Тернопіль: Підручники й посібники, 239.

42. Ущина В.А. Модальні засоби суб'єктного позиціонування в англійському медіа-дискурсі. *Нова філологія*. Збірник наукових праць. Вип. 57. Запоріжжя: ЗНУ. С. 93-98.

ILLUSTRATIVE SOURCES

43. Kudhail Perisha. *Quiet quitting: The workplace trend taking over TikTok*. BBC News, 31 August 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/news/business-62638908>

44. Christian Alex. *Why 'quiet quitting' is nothing new*. BBC Worklife, 29 August 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20220825-why-quiet-quitting-is-nothing-new>

45. Christian Alex. *Why hybrid work is emotionally exhausting*. BBC Worklife, 21 January 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20220120-why-hybrid-work-is-emotionally-exhausting>

- 46.** Tatum Megan. *The remote 'helicopter bosses' who stunt worker resilience.* BBC Worklife, 1 December 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20221130-the-remote-helicopter-bosses-who-stunt-worker-resilience>
- 47.** Christian Alex. *How flexibility made managers miserable.* BBC Worklife, 28 November 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20221123-how-flexibility-made-managers-miserable>
- 48.** Lufkin Bryan. *The companies doubling down on remote work.* BBC Worklife, 25 July 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20220722-the-companies-doubling-down-on-remote-work>
- 49.** Turits Meredith. *The five big things we know about return-to-office so far.* BBC Worklife, 21 July 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20220718-the-five-big-things-we-know-about-return-to-office-so-far>
- 50.** Carnegie Megan. *How return-to-office uncertainty is leaving workers in limbo.* BBC Worklife, 20 July 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20220719-how-return-to-office-uncertainty-is-leaving-workers-in-limbo>
- 51.** Turits Meredith. *The six big things we've learned about hybrid work so far.* BBC Worklife, 30 June 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20220628-the-six-big-things-weve-learned-about-hybrid-work-so-far>
- 52.** Epstein Sophia. *Have people forgotten how to behave in the office?* BBC Worklife, 29 June 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20220627-have-people-forgotten-how-to-behave-in-the-office>
- 53.** Christian Alex. *The employee surveillance that fuels worker distrust.* BBC Worklife, 27 June 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20220621-the-employee-surveillance-that-fuels-worker-distrust>
- 54.** Tatum Megan. *The people who hate working from home.* BBC Worklife, 20 June 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20220616-the-people-who-hate-working-from-home>

55. Christian Alex. *The simmering tension between remote and in-office workers.* BBC Worklife, 11 April 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20220408-the-simmering-tension-between-remote-and-in-office-workers>

56. Christian Alex. *What the war for worker talent really looks like.* BBC Worklife, 25 April 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20220421-what-the-war-for-worker-talent-really-looks-like>

57. Christian Alex. *The entry-level workers earning six-figure salaries.* BBC Worklife, 05 April 2022. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20220401-the-entry-level-workers-earning-six-figure-salaries>

58. Christian Alex. *What's the problem with inventing flashy new job titles?* BBC Worklife, 09 January 2023. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20230104-inventing-new-job-titles>

59. Nguyen Ellen. *The workers quitting digital nomadism.* BBC Worklife, 08 June 2023. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20230531-the-workers-quitting-digital-nomadism>

60. Lufkin Bryan. *Is the great digital-nomad workforce actually coming?* BBC Worklife, 15 June 2021. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20210615-is-the-great-digital-nomad-workforce-actually-coming>

61. Christian Alex. *Will the four-day workweek get employees back in office?* BBC Worklife, 05 June 2023. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20230530-will-the-four-day-workweek-get-employees-back-in-office>

62. Carnegie Megan. *Why Gen Z are so motivated by pay.* BBC Worklife, 31st May 2023. <https://www.bbc.com/worklife/article/20230530-why-gen-z-are-so-motivated-by-pay>

SUMMARY

The bachelor paper focuses on expressing modality in English. **The relevance** of this research is explained by the fact that understanding the complexities of modality requires a multidimensional approach that encompasses linguistic, cognitive, and discourse perspectives. This paper views modality as an integral part of human cognition and conceptualization, and explains how a speaker conveys his/her subjective stance, uncertainty, asserts authority, negotiates social relationships, and shapes discourse patterns.

The object of the research is the lexical and grammatical means of expressing modality and their role and functions in communication.

The subject is represented by the analysis of verb-predicates, modal verbs and related expressions.

The aim of this bachelor's paper is to explore the linguistic means of expressing modality in English.

In order to fulfill the aim of the research, it is important to outline the following **tasks**:

- 1) To define modality in English from different perspectives.
- 2) To identify language means expressing modality in English.
- 3) To analyze moods of the predicate-verbs.
- 4) To explain the meanings and functions of modal verbs and related expressions.

Solving this set of goals is supported by the method of system analysis, which is of crucial importance for such type of investigation, and some other specific scientific **methods and techniques**: description (in characterizing modality and the expressions which convey it); semantic analysis (in the analysis of meaning of the expressions); contextual analysis (in identifying the realization of meanings in context).

The material for this paper includes authentic language data from a range of sources, including written texts, spoken interactions, and digital communication, that we obtained from the Internet.

The outlined definitions presented in the theoretical part enable us to state that the early approaches to modality primarily focused on the grammatical and syntactic aspects, often centering on the traditional modal verbs such as *can*, *could*, *may*, and *must*. Scholars sought to establish a set of rules governing the usage of modal verbs, categorizing them based on their epistemic and deontic meanings.

The advent of modern linguistic theories, particularly cognitive linguistics and discourse studies, brought about a paradigm shift in the study of modality. Rather than viewing modality as a rigid grammatical category, modern approaches recognize its inseparable connection with human cognition and conceptualization. Scholars now explore the subjective nature of modal expressions and their role in shaping a speaker's perspective on events and states.

Within the realm of modern approaches, various types of modality have been identified and classified: *epistemic* referring to the speaker's assessment of the likelihood or truth of a proposition; *deontic*, dealing with the speaker's evaluation of necessity, obligation, permission, or prohibition, *evaluative*, conveying the speaker's subjective evaluation or appraisal of a situation or entity.

As a result of practical research we've come to the following. Modal verbs and moods of verbs uncover the intricate ways in which these linguistic devices contribute to the expression of modality in language.

The examination of moods of verbs has revealed the discursive aspects of modality, shedding light on how speakers negotiate their stance, authority, and interpersonal relationships in communication. The indicative mood, for instance, conveys factual statements or objective descriptions, while the subjunctive mood brings forth hypothetical or counterfactual situations. By employing these different moods, speakers can assert their beliefs, express doubt, make suggestions, or impose obligations in a given discourse context.

The interplay between cognitive structures and discursive functions becomes evident as we observe the dynamic nature of modality in language use. Speakers employ modal verbs and moods of verbs strategically to shape their discourse, influence the perceptions of their interlocutors, and convey their subjective attitudes towards the proposition being discussed. Whether it is the use of modal verbs to express permission or the selection of a specific mood to convey a subtle evaluative stance, modality plays a central role in constructing meaning and facilitating effective communication.