

КИЇВСЬКИЙ НАЦІОНАЛЬНИЙ ЛІНГВІСТИЧНИЙ УНІВЕРСИТЕТ

Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології

імені професора Г. Г. Почепцова

Кваліфікаційна робота магістра з лінгвістики на тему:

«МАРКЕРИ ЙМОВІРНОСТІ В СУЧАСНІЙ АНГЛІЙСЬКІЙ МОВІ: НОМІНАТИВНИЙ ТА ПРАГМАТИЧНИЙ АСПЕКТИ»

Студентки групи МЛа 58-19
факультету германської філології
освітньо-професійної програми
сучасні філологічні студії (англійська
мова і друга іноземна мова): лінгвістика
та перекладознавство
за спеціальністю 0.35 Філологія
спеціалізація 035.041 Германські мови та
літератури (переклад включно), перша –
англійська

Долініної Дар'ї Сергіївни

Допущена до захисту

« ____ » _____ року

Завідувач кафедри

_____ Шутова М.О.

(підпис) (ПБ)

Науковий керівник:

канд. філол. наук, доц. Березенко В.М.

Національна шкала _____

Кількість балів _____

Оцінка ЄКТС _____

Київ – 2020

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine

Kyiv National Linguistic University

Prof. G.G. Pocheptsov Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Master`s Qualification Paper

**PROBABILITY MARKERS IN MODERN ENGLISH:
NOMINATIVE AND PRAGMATIC ASPECTS**

DOLININA DARIA

Group 58-19

Department of Germanic Philology

Research Adviser

Assoc. Prof. **BEREZENKO V. M.**

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv 2020

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	3
CHAPTER ONE. PROBLEMS OF MODALITY AND MODAL WORDS IN LINGUISTICS	6
1.1. Language modality and means of its expression	6
1.2. The question of adverbs of probability in foreign English studies.....	12
1.3. The problem of modal words in linguistics.....	17
Conclusions to Chapter One	22
CHAPTER TWO. NOMINATIVE ASPECT OF MODAL WORDS IN THE MODERN ENGLISH LANGUAGE	23
2.1. Modal words as units of nomination	23
2.2. Semantic types of modal words	32
Conclusions to Chapter Two	44
CHAPTER THREE. COMMUNICATIVE AND PRAGMATIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MODAL WORDS	46
3.1. Modal words of probability as a means of expressing modality in dialogical speech. Modal words as modifiers of speech acts	46
3.2. Pragmatic probability markers in monological texts	55
Conclusions to Chapter Three	66
GENERAL CONCLUSIONS	68
RESUME	72
LIST OF REFERENCES	76
LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS	83
APPENDIX	86

INTRODUCTION

The master's thesis is devoted to the study of probability markers in modern English, in particular nominative and pragmatic aspects.

Modality is one of the current problems of modern linguistics. The question of the promulgation of the essential characteristics of this category is put at the heart by many prominent figures of scientific thought, in particular, by linguists V.V. Vinogradov, Ch. Bally, V.G. Admoni, G.A. Zolotova, V.G. Gak, V.N. Yartseva etc. The diversity of research opinion is due to the complexity and versatility of this category.

This paper examines the linguistic means of objectifying the modal meaning of "possibility / probability" in modern English. The debatable nature of the existing modal meanings and ways of expressing them made it possible to identify and analyze the main lexical and grammatical ways of expressing probability markers on the material of literary, journalistic and scientific texts.

Review of the scientific literature on the research question, namely: probability markers in modern English: nominative and pragmatic aspects (L.G. Davydenko, L.S. Ermolaeva, V.B. Kasevich, F. Palmer, G. Leech, A. Kratzer, etc.) makes it possible to argue that in modern linguistics this problem is not given enough attention.

The topicality of this study is due to the general focus of modern linguistic research on the identification of probability markers in modern English, in particular nominative and pragmatic aspects. Modal markers of probability have repeatedly become the object of linguistic research. However, compared to the markers of certainty in the accuracy of information, markers of probability have been studied less frequently. In this regard, the relevance of the study is determined by the need for a comprehensive description of this group of markers as functional linguistic units in the nominative and pragmatic aspects, necessary to assess the connection between the utterance and a certain situation in the real world, and more broadly, to ensure the coherence of discourse as a whole.

The **aim** of this work is to study probability markers in modern English, including nominative and pragmatic aspects.

To achieve this goal the following **objectives** were set:

- 1) to determine the theoretical foundations of the study of modality and modal words in linguistics;
- 2) to characterize the linguistic modality and means of its expression;
- 3) to explore the issue of probability adverbs in English-language research;
- 4) to single out the nominative aspect of modal words in modern English;
- 5) to consider modal words as units of nomination and semantic types of modal words;
- 6) to determine the communicative and pragmatic characteristics of modal words;
- 7) to analyze modal probability markers as a means of expressing modality in dialogic speech;
- 8) to describe pragmatic probability markers in monologue texts.

The object of the paper is the category of modality in English.

The subject of the present study is probability markers in modern English, including nominative and pragmatic aspects.

The **data research** are literary, journalistic and scientific texts selected from the works of fiction of British and American writers, political speeches, newspaper and scientific articles.

Methods of research used in the paper are determined by the purpose, objectives and analyzed material: *comparative method*, which consists in the correlation of lexical, lexical-grammatical, syntactic, pragmatic and semantic features of probability markers; *contextual-interpretive*, which is to clarify the specifics of the meaning of modal words and verbs of probability in literary, journalistic and scientific texts; *descriptive*, which was used to justify the use of a certain type of probability markers.

The **scientific novelty** of the study is that it comprehensively examines the markers of probability in modern English, including nominative and pragmatic

aspects. A study of the features of text fragments with probability markers on the material of different discourses is carried out.

Theoretical value of the master's paper lies in the fact that the results of the study clarify the concept of probability markers. This work makes a significant contribution to the development of disciplines such as linguistics, stylistics, grammar, pragmatics of the English language.

Practical value of the master's thesis is that the analyzed material can be used in lectures on linguistics, translation studies, stylistics, English grammar. The proposed study is not only scientific and cognitive in nature. Its results can be useful for philologists and translators who seek to improve their professional level.

The logic of the study determined the **structure** of the master's thesis, which consists of introduction, three chapters, conclusions to each chapter, general conclusions to the whole paper, the list of references, the list of illustrative material, appendix and resume.

In the **Introduction** the paper presents the object and the subject of the investigation, underlines the topicality of the problem under study, mentions the novelty of the gained results, sets the main aim and the objectives by which it is achieved, considers the methods of research used in the paper, and discusses the content of each chapter separately.

Chapter One presents general theoretical aspects of the study of modality and modal words in linguistics; linguistic modality and means of its expression; the question of probability adverbs in English-language studies.

Chapter Two considers nominative aspect of modal words in modern English; modal words as units of nomination; semantic types of modal words.

Chapter Three makes a survey of the communicative and pragmatic characteristics of modal words; modal probability markers as a means of expressing modality in dialogic speech; pragmatic probability markers in monologue texts.

The paper is crowned with the suggestion of other perspectives of research in the area.

CHAPTER ONE. PROBLEMS OF MODALITY AND MODAL WORDS IN DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN LINGUISTICS

1.1. Language modality and means of its expression

Today the problem of text research is one of the most relevant and controversial in modern linguistics. In text analysis, text categories are increasingly a priority in linguistic search. Despite the significant intensification of research in this area, the problem of text categories remains controversial, and the question of the number, typology and hierarchy of text categories, establishing clear criteria for possible classifications, studying the content and mode of expression, the nature of formation, systematization, the definitions of the functions of linguistic and non-linguistic means of the categories of text are finally unresolved. One of the main categories of the text is modality [Коцюба, p. 42].

The research of the *category of modality* is relevant, despite considerable experience in considering this issue in foreign linguistics [Безноса, p. 206]. We can consider the concept of modality “as a grammatically, lexically, intonationally expressed attitude of the speaker to the reported or reported to reality” [Ткачук, p. 99]. V.G. Admoni [1999], Ch. Bally [2015], O.V. Bondarko [2003], V.V. Vinogradov [2009], G.O. Zolotova [2010], V.M. Tkachuk [2003], V.D. Shynkaruk [2011] and others have made a great contribution to the study and analysis of the theory of modality and methods of its implementation in language and speech.

Depending on what is being evaluated – the extralingual reality or the statement itself – scientists distinguish two types of modality, respectively: objective and subjective. V.D. Shynkaruk believes that modality as a category of mode, like other categories (persuasiveness, evaluation, authorization), is directly related to the use of a sentence in a speech act. It directly depends on the intention of the speaker, because the meanings that make up the mode of the sentence are mainly intentional-communicative. These meanings are superimposed on the very meaning, modify it and provide the actual binding of the sentence to the reference

situation and its introduction to the text” [Шинкарук, p. 20-21]. The linguist contrasts three levels of sentence – formal, semantic and communicative – distinguishes between mode and communicative aspect and believes that the subjectivity of mode and communicative aspect is different. The mode reveals subjectivity “in the interests of the speaker”, and in the communicative aspect – “subjectivity in the interests of the listener” [Шинкарук, p. 23].

Subjective modality is inherent in any utterance that functions within the coordinates “addresser – addressee”, because the speaker in one way or another reveals his or her attitude to the message. Moreover, it is one of the categories that form statements. According to V.M. Tkachuk, the functional and semantic category that forms the functionally semantic field is a subjective modality. The semantic dominant of the functionally semantic field of modality is best defined by the word ‘evaluation’, i.e. it emphasizes hypothetical or unreal nature, necessity or possibility, etc., pointing to the specific existence of a certain construct of consciousness [Ткачук, p. 48].

The semantic scope of subjective modality is wider than the semantic scope of objective modality. The meaning of subjective modality is produced by the modal words and particles that form its core. They do not change the basic modal meaning of the statement, but give it a special coloring. With the help of modal words, the speaker evaluates his statement in terms of its relation to objective reality.

The problem of studying language indicators of modality expression is practically not paid attention. Reflecting on the Active Voice, V.V. Vinogradov noted that the forms of the Active Voice do not express the emotional and volitional attitude of the subject to the action. Forms of the active voice are ‘objective’. But this objectivity may be surrounded by various shades of subjective representation, which is inherent in tense forms. Modal words can turn the meaning of direct assertion or denial of the fact, inherent in the active voice, in the meaning of unreliability, doubt, even unreality of action [Виноградов, p. 587-591].

Modal words give a statement various modal and expressive meanings (assumption, doubt, surprise, motivation, evaluation, etc.). The peculiarity of these statements is that they do not convey the unreal meaning characteristic of the form of the Conditional Mood. Thus, modal words modify the utterance, affect its modal coloring, reduce categoricalness, promote ease, immediacy of communication and affect politeness.

The concept of **modality**, which was applied to the logic of judgment by Aristotle and was further explored in the works by I. Kant, later began to be used in linguistics and mathematical logic. In logics, modality is the most essential feature of judgment as a form of thinking, defined as a category that classifies judgment depending on the nature of the relationship between the subject of judgment and its feature, i.e. depending on the nature of objective relationships reflected in judgment, or as a degree of authenticity of the opinion transmitted in the judgment [Бурлакова, p. 148].

In linguistics, modality is one of the most important characteristics of a sentence and is interpreted as a category that expresses the connection between the utterance and reality. Various researchers define modality as a grammatical, syntactic or semantic category. R.A. Budagov, for example, considers modality as a grammatical category [Будагов, p. 109]; L.S. Yermolaeva considers modality to be a syntactic category, noting that lexical means remain outside the syntactic modality [Ермолаева, URL]

As a semantic category, modality is considered by G.V. Kolshansky [Колшанский 2013], I.B. Khlebnikova [Цивьян, URL], because the modal content can be expressed by different linguistic means. These include grammatical (morphological), lexical (modal words), lexical and grammatical (modal verbs) and intonation means [Зверева, p. 17]. Thorough linguistic studies of modality require a comprehensive consideration of the flow of speech in close connection with all sections of linguistics. The specificity of modality is that modal meanings are not always represented by markers that belong to the same level. The same of modality

are expressed by means described in morphology, syntax, phonetics, and linguistics of the text.

In the Great Encyclopedic Dictionary modality (from the Latin ‘modus’ – measure, method) is considered as a functional and semantic category that expresses different types of relations of expression to reality, as well as different types of subjective qualification of the message [Ярцева, p. 303]. The sphere of modality includes [Шведова, p. 303]:

- 1) opposition of the expressed by the nature of their communicative attitude (statement – question – motivation);
- 2) opposition on the grounds of ‘assertion – denial’;
- 3) gradations of meanings in the range ‘reality – unreality’ (reality – hypothetical nature – unreality), different degrees of confidence of the speaker in the validity of his idea about reality that is formed;
- 4) various changes in the relationship between the subject and the predicate, expressed by lexical means (‘wants’, ‘can’, ‘should’, ‘need’).

O.S. Akhmanova considers modality as a conceptual category with the meaning of the speaker’s attitude to the utterance and the relation of the utterance to reality [АХМАНОВА, p. 237]. According to the definition of M.Ya. Blokh, modality as a category in English can be manifested “in the field of grammatical elements of language and in the sphere of its lexical and nominative elements. In this sense, any word that expresses an assessment of the surrounding reality should be defined as modal” [БЛОХ, p. 98].

M. Grepl identifies three aspects of modality: “general modality” (basic), and within it – four modal statuses (message, question, order, wish), “voluntary modality” and “true modality” (veracity). The author notes that “voluntary modality” expresses the attitude of the subject of the action to the very action, and “modality of truth” – the degree of confidence in the content of the speaker’s expression in real significance [ГРЕПЛ, p. 13].

Determining the category of modality, according to G.A. Zolotova, includes three meanings:

- 1) the attitude of the statement to reality from the point of view of the speaker;
- 2) the attitude of the speaker to the content of the utterance;
- 3) the attitude of the subject of action to the action [Золотова, p. 12].

L.S. Yermolaeva distinguishes between the following main types of modality – “internal” and “external”. “Internal” modality means the attitude of the subject of the action to the action performed by him; under “external” – the ratio of the content of the sentence to reality in terms of reality – unreality (type I) and the degree of confidence of the speaker about the reported facts (type II) [Ермолаева, URL].

Although L.S. Yermolaeva speaks of two types of modality, in fact, its classification includes three types of modality, the meanings of which are similar to the meanings analyzed by G.A Zolotova. Thus, the specificity of internal modality is that this type does not give a modal description of the whole sentence, but only gives a modal description of the relationship within the sentence (i.e. “internal modality”) [Золотова, p. 22]. Modal verbs are the main means of expressing the modal relationship between the subject of action and action in English. In a sentence, they are part of a compound verbal modal predicate and show the speaker’s attitude to the action of the sentence [Золотова, p. 25].

The external modality (type I) means the relationship of the content of the sentence to reality in terms of ‘reality – unreality’. L.S. Yermolaeva considers opposition of ‘reality – unreality’ on the basis of compliance or inconsistency of the content of the statement of reality, the main means of which are the forms of the Mood. In the external modality (type II), the role of the speaker is especially distinguished, because in this type of modality the degree of confidence, doubt (or uncertainty) of the speaker in accordance with the content of the statement is expressed. This modal meaning is conveyed, for example, by modal verbs that perform a secondary function and show the modal relation to the whole sentence [Ермолаева, URL].

Analysis of the scientific literature on this issue shows that the interpretation of the *category of modality* is extremely broad. However, in general, linguists tend to believe that the category of modality reflects two types of logical and grammatical connections: the relationship of the content of the sentence to objective reality and the attitude of the speaker to the content of the sentence (statement). The first type of connection is called “objective modality”, while the second one is considered as a form of speech and is called “subjective modality” [Касевич, p. 17–18].

For example, E.A. Zvereva distinguishes between objective and subjective modality. The researcher points out that objective modality expresses the relations that objectively exist in reality – the relations of necessity or possibility due to objective reasons. Subjective modality reflects only the opinion of the speaker about the necessity, possibility or probability of an action or state [Зверева, p. 79].

N.Yu. Shvedova also distinguishes between objective and subjective modality. The researcher includes in the modal meanings all those that are defined as objectively modal. That is, the meaning of the relationship of what we are speaking about (the reported), to reality. She notes that the modal meanings also include all those that express the attitude of the speaker to what he reports – these are subjective modal meanings [Шведова, p. 215].

Objective modality is a mandatory feature of any utterance and one of the categories that forms predicative unit – the sentence. This type of modality expresses the relationship of the reported to reality in terms of reality and unreality. The main means of formalizing modality in this function is the category of the Mood. The main means of expressing the real objective modality are the tense forms of the verbs of the Indicative Mood. Unreal objective modal meanings are expressed by forms of the Conditional Mood [Шахматов, p. 215].

Subjective modality is the expression of a speaker’s attitude to the utterance (confidence / uncertainty, agreement / disagreement, expressive evaluation). It is an optional feature of an utterance, and its semantic scope is wider than the semantic scope of objective modality. Linguistic means of this type of modality are

word order, intonation, lexical repetitions, modal words and verbs, exclamations, parenthetic words and phrases, inserted sentences, word order in a sentence [Почепцов, p. 180]. The semantic basis of subjective modality is formed by the concept of evaluation in the broadest sense of the word, including not only the logic of the qualification of the reported, but also different types of emotional reaction.

1.2. The question of adverbs of probability in foreign English studies

Many scholars consider modal words to be a separate part of speech. Their syntactic function is the function of the inserted part of the sentence. When considering these lexical units, the opinions of leading linguists are divided, and two options become possible [Diver, p. 325]: either it is a special category, or adverbs that have been drawn into the sphere of modality and do not cease to be adverbs.

According to their meaning, modal words can be divided, depending on the subjective attitude to the facts of reality, into words – statements, assumptions and words that evaluate the statement in terms of desirability or undesirability. Most modal words in English come from adverbs and have the suffix -ly, so modal words are often close to adverbs and parts. For this reason, it is difficult to distinguish them from the latter.

Czech linguist Miroslav Grepl [Грепл, p. 111], identifies three aspects of modality:

- 1) “general modality” (basic) with 4 modal statuses inside (message, question, order, wish);
- 2) “volitional or voluntary modality”, expressing the author’s attitude to the text;
- 3) “modality of truth” – the degree of confidence of the author in the real significance of the content of the text.

Thus, the “volitional modality” and the “modality of truth” by M. Grepl essentially correspond to the internal modality and the second type of external modality in the classification by L. Ermolaeva. She identifies the same modality meanings using a different formulation [ibid, p. 23]:

- 1) internal modality – the author’s attitude to the text;
- 2) external modality:
 - a) the first type is the relation of the text to reality (reality / unreality);
 - b) the second type – the degree of confidence of the author in the facts communicated by him.

A curious description of the types of modality has been presented by L.I. Zimmermann [Зимберманн, с. 128]:

- 1) hypothetical conditional modality:
 - a) the possibility of consequence;
 - b) hypothesis – an assumption limited by certain conditions, expressed or implied;
 - c) declaration of the result – confidence that the result will be obtained;
- 2) desirable modality:
 - a) the desire to get the necessary result;
 - b) a recommendation to obtain a result;
 - c) the need to obtain a result;
 - d) the need to perform a certain action to obtain a result;
 - e) the categorical need for the desired result.

In Palmer’s opinion, all types of modality can be divided into two large semantic groups [Palmer, с. 176]:

- 1) possibility, probability and conditionality by certain circumstances;
- 2) obligation, starting with desirability and ending with the necessity, inevitability of an action.

In addition to differences in the definition of the concept of modality of the text, there are differences in views on the categorical affiliation of this concept. Various authors define modality as a grammatical, syntactic or semantic category

[Swan, c. 328]. The modality of the text is manifested at the level of the word (lexical), sentence (syntactic) and text (text).

The paradigm of words to express a particular modal meaning in modern English is quite large: verbs, nouns, adverbs, particles, and so on. The authors of *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* have classified various lexical units to express modal relations into several groups. Among the main ones they included such modal verbs as: can, could, may, might, must, shall, should, will, would [Quirk, p. 137].

The difficulty of qualifying basic modal verbs is that, depending on their actual use in speech, they can express both subjective and objective modal meaning. The concept of objective modality “is used to characterize the relationship between utterance and reality, and the concept of subjective modality – to characterize the attitude of the speaker to the utterance” [Кобозева, p. 240]. However, today, the studies of the language category of modality use different terminological units to denote subjective and objective modality. Thus, subjective modality is also called “evaluative” and “epistemic”, and objective – “unreal” or “deontic” [Плунгян, p. 431–432].

In this exploration, we will use common terminological names: objective and subjective modality, without pursuing the goal of theoretical justification of all the above terms.

Semantically, N.A. Kobrina divides modal adverbs into three groups [Кобрина, p. 67]:

1) words-statements: *certainly, of course, indeed, surely, decidedly, really, definitely, naturally, no doubt etc.*;

2) modal words-assumptions: *perhaps, maybe, probably, obviously, possibly, evidently, apparently etc.*;

3) modal words that evaluate the statement in terms of desirability or undesirability: *luckily, fortunately, happily, unfortunately, unluckily etc.*

Foreign grammarians P.R. Kroeger [Kroeger, p. 166] and A. Downing [Downing, p. 379] include the following meanings of the main modal verbs in subjective modality – certainty, **probability** and possibility. These three modalities demonstrate different degrees of trust of the speaker or the absence of such in relation to the authenticity / truthfulness of the sentence [Downing, p. 381]. The modal meaning of possibility indicates the lowest level of confidence in the action. It is an integral part of the semantic meaning of such modal verbs as *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, revealing different distribution. The verbs *can* / *could* are related to the expression “real possibility”, while *may* / *might* express “only the opinion (of a person) about the problem, i.e. conjecture, assumption of possibility” and are related to the expression of subjective, “human” [Штелинг, p. 190].

The average degree of confidence – the modal meaning of **probability** – is expressed by the modal verb *should*, one of the components of the meaning of which is a probable assumption (tentative inference). In the case of *should* the opinion is expressed about the necessity, i.e. the expediency of action from the point of view of the speaker [Штелинг, p. 191].

Using this modal verb, the speaker tells about the probability of something or believes that something should be expected based on the facts known to him. The main semantic difference of this modal verb from *must* is that it implicitly implies non-performance of the declared action, while *must* and *will* do not have such a meaning [Downing, p. 383].

The highest degree of trust – the modal meaning of confidence / certainty – is expressed by the modal verbs *will*, *would*, *shall* and *must*. The speaker’s use of the modal verbs *will*, *would*, *shall* in the sense of ‘conviction’ is based on the speaker’s experience, facts known to him or how something usually happens. This confidence can be strengthened by an introduction – *I assume that*. However, the modal verb *must* expresses a slightly different meaning of confidence – a logical necessity: something that is necessary because it is correct [Downing, p. 382].

Objective modality contains in its semantic plane several components of meanings: obligation, permission, volition, ability [Kroeger, p. 122]. The last two meanings are also included in the dynamic type of modality. Its difference from objective modality is whether the determining factors of modal meanings are external (objective) or internal (dynamic) relative to the subject of speech [Downing, p. 15]. The conceptual meaning of volition, can be conveyed by three modal verbs – shall, will and would. In the last two verbs, this modal meaning is further decomposed into three semantic components – intention, desire and persistence [Quirk, p. 292].

Using these modal verbs, the speaker demonstrates clearly defined intentions, promises, or threats. The modal meaning of obligation in English is conveyed by two main modal verbs – *should* and *must*. According to the degree of expression of the sign, *must* belongs to a strong member of the opposition, because it conveys the meaning of inevitable duty or coercion. At the same time, *should* expresses a small, weak commitment, a recommendation.

As noted by D.A. Stelling, the verb *must* outside the combination with the infinitive in the form of the Perfect and in the Continuous form, usually does not express anything subjective: it is a statement of objective necessity, inevitability of something (“it should be”, “usually it happens”, “it cannot be otherwise”, etc.) [Штелинг, p. 191]. Another meaning that belongs to objective modality is the modal meaning of permission. In English, it is expressed by several major modal verbs: *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*. *May* is a more formal equivalent of *can* and conveys a very polite form of permission, “given directly by the speaker” [ibid, p. 223]. At the same time, *can* denotes a more “general” type of permission and is understood rather as a generally accepted, established order [ibid, p. 224].

The objective modal meaning of ability is conveyed by only two modal verbs in English: *can* and *could*. In this sense, according to A. Downing [Downing, p. 392], the modal verb *can* can have various pragmatic interpretations (desire, order, request, existence).

Summing up our research on the peculiarities of the use of basic modal verbs, it is legitimate to argue about their more frequent use with the meaning of subjective modality, which, of course, gives a general subjectivity. However, the use of lexical, grammatical and syntactic language means capable of conveying the meaning of objective and subjective modality needs to be further analyzed.

1.3. The problem of modal words in linguistics

A *modal word* is interpreted as a word that has lost its specific meaning and functions as a means of descriptive representation of modality. Modal word is a part of speech that includes invariant words that express a subjective attitude to the expressed thought [Wright, p. 178]. The form of modal words does not distinguish any specific external feature. But the other two features, semantic and syntactic, are presented quite clearly, which allows many linguists to distinguish them in a separate part of speech.

The semantic feature of modal words is their meaning of subjective attitude to the statement in terms of its authenticity, proximity and desirability. A modal word serves as an inserted part of a sentence, much less often as a sentence word. In modern English, modal words include the following [Ралдугіна, URL]:

Table 1.3.

Classification of modal words in English

Words expressing confidence	Words- “amplifiers”	Words expressing uncertainty	Words expressing approval and disapproval
certainly	indeed	perhaps	happily – unhappily
of course	evidently	maybe	luckily – unluckily
no doubt	naturally	probably	

surely	obviously	possibly	fortunately– unfortunately
apparently	really		
assuredly	actually		
undoubtedly			

The most commonly used modal words include [Ралдугіна, URL]:

a) modal words expressing uncertainty in the probability of the reported – *maybe, perhaps, probably*;

b) modal words expressing approval and disapproval – *fortunately, unfortunately, luckily, unluckily, happily, unhappily*;

c) modal words- “amplifiers” – *really*;

d) modal words that express confidence in the reported *of course, sure, surely, to be sure, sure enough, evidently, obviously, no doubt, naturally, really*.

Thus, we can conclude that in modern English there are grammatical and lexical means of expressing modality. Grammatical means include verbs *must, should, ought, will / would, can / could, may / might, need*. At the same time, these verbs weaken their primary meaning of desirability, necessity, duty, and convey only the speaker’s attitude to the subject of the utterance. Lexical means include modal words, such as: *perhaps, maybe, probably, possibly*.

Modality belongs to the universal categories that are reflected in various fields of science, and, moreover, underlie entire scientific approaches. The concept of ‘modality’ is used by philosophy and logics, the study of language is impossible without the classification of statements on a modal basis [Palmer, p. 66]. Only considering this term in all its versatility of meanings, it is possible to form an idea of what is a category of modality. Recently, science has become increasingly anthropocentric, with interest in the category of modality growing in areas that study the impact of language on human behavior and thought, such as psycholinguistics and cognitive linguistics. This leads to the comprehension of

new aspects of this category, but at the same time expands the range of issues that need research.

Modality is present in the text at three basic levels: lexical, syntactic and textual. Therefore, the ability to use modality in the text is not limited to mastering English vocabulary, morphology, syntax, etc. It is also fundamentally important to master language strategies and genres that are characteristic of texts of different styles in English.

At the *lexical level*, there is a wide range of means of expressing modality in texts [Zandvoort, p. 128]:

- 1) modal verbs (*must, can*);
- 2) modal words (*in fact, in truth*);
- 3) articles (*a, the*);
- 4) types of tense forms of the verb (*done, agreed*);
- 5) adverbs (*probably, surely*);
- 6) constructions with an adjective or participle.

Given the grammatical synonymy within each means individually, their number and ambiguity as a whole, we are clearly faced with the problem: the variety of means of expressing modality.

At the *syntactic level*, modal diversity becomes even more explicit, since we can add to the list above [Leech, p. 276]:

- 1) the Subjunctive, Conditional Mood (including Conditionals): conditions and criteria for the reality of assumptions, possibility, probability,
- 2) constructions with wish: regret, lack of factual material,
- 3) introductory phrases (hedging expressions): uncertainty, doubt, ambiguity;
- 4) emphatic “do”: confidence, peremptory statement,
- 5) passive constructions with *get*: confidence in the final result,
- 6) tag questions: doubt, uncertainty.

This list clearly shows how diverse and “subtle” a modality is in the English language and confirms Halliwell’s statement: “You cannot find only one specific place in a sentence where there is a modality” [Halliwell, c. 187].

Very important for understanding and rather problematic, in our opinion, is the interpretation of the modal meaning of reality-unreality [Зверева, p. 25]. The scope of these two concepts is different for various authors. L.S. Ermolaeva believes that facts seem to be real, not only accomplished or accomplishing at a certain point in time, but also facts whose reality is only possible, desirable, necessary or assumed [Ермолаева, URL]. Facts that are either unfulfilled or unprovable in the indicated period of time, which, however, are conditionally referred to as accomplished or possible, appear to be unrealistic.

Other scholars understand the unreality of a scientific fact of equivalent presumption, hypothetical [Langacker; Palmer]. The question of what kind of “modal conditions” can be put forward for facts that claim to be reality remains open. At the same time, the degree of reality of one or another fact can vary depending on the lexical means of modality.

The modality of the text belongs to the category of subjective-objective categories, the subjectivity of the modal assessment of the reality of the author of the text is limited by both objectively existing relationships and the language set of typed means of expression.

In this section, we consider one of the means of expressing subjective modality in English, namely modal words and verbs. Modal words convey the subjective attitude of the speaker to the utterance, express the speaker’s assessment, the relationship between the statement in the sentence and reality. This assessment can be represented by varying degrees of confidence, doubt, desirability of action expressed in the sentence [Зверева, p. 279].

Modal verbs reflect the speaker’s attitude to the action expressed by the infinitive, in combination with which they form compound modal predicates. Thus, they can express an action, state or process, which is considered by the speaker as possible, mandatory, doubtful, accurate, permissible, desirable, etc. [Зверева, p.

160]. These are modal verbs such as: *can, may, must, should, shall, will, would, need, ought to, dare, to be to, to have (to have got to)*. Thus, the modal verb *can* has two forms: *can* – for the present tense and *could* – for the past tense and denotes a theoretical possibility, the possibility of an idea, which is associated with the admission of complete freedom to act; with some value of ability, resolution [ibid, p. 161].

The modal verb *may* has two forms: *may* and *might* and denotes the possibility of fact, actions that are associated with the idea of the absence of obstacles; possibility as a specific probability of action, with some shades of meaning, such as uncertainty, resolution and others [Войналович, p. 30]. The modal verb *must* has only one form and is used to express necessity, order, advice. The modal verb *to have (to have got to)* expresses the obligation or necessity arising from the circumstances [ibid, p. 31]. The modal verb *to be to* expresses a duty or necessity associated with a prior arrangement, a plan.

The modal verb *need* is used to determine the need to perform an action. The modal verb *ought to* is used to express moral duty, advice, probability, necessity. The modal verb *should* can express a moral obligation, advice, opportunity, desire. The modal verb *shall* does not always have a modal meaning. When it is combined with an imperfect infinitive, the verb expresses intention, promise, threat, proposal. The modal verb *will / would* denotes intention, readiness, polite request, command, inevitability of action. The modal verb *dare* can express risk, challenge [Зверева, p. 172-179].

Thus, modality is a complex multifaceted functional and semantic category that expresses the attitude of the speaker to what is being said, his assessment of the attitude to objective reality. The content of what is said can be considered as real or unreal, possible or impossible, necessary or probable, desirable or undesirable, and so on. Modality is differentiated into objective and subjective. Subjective modality, in contrast to the objective one, is an optional feature of an utterance and is expressed by such means as: word order, intonation, lexical repetitions, modal words and verbs, exclamations, parenthetical words and phrases,

parenthetic sentences, word order in a sentence. The study of the specifics of the means of expression of objective modality may be the subject of further linguistic research.

Conclusions to Chapter One

Studying the concept of modality, we have come to the conclusion that in linguistics there are two types of modality with their further division into subtypes: subjective modality: a) subtype – the relationship between the subject of the action and the action, b) subtype – the attitude of the speaker to the content of the statement; objective modality: subtype – the attitude of the content of the utterance to reality (in terms of ‘reality-unreality’). Having examined the category of modality, we have determined that the category of modality is an objective-subjective lexico-grammatical category, one of the component parts of which is probability.

As a result of the study of the concept of probability, the following its shades have been highlighted: full confidence; almost complete confidence; assumption: about the possibility of action, which includes uncertainty, doubt about the possibility of action, about the impossibility of action, which includes incredibility, implausibility of the action.

The results of the research have showed that linguistic means of expressing probability in the English language comprise a large class, which includes modal verbs, modal words, verbs and phrases of mental activity, Moods; they can complement (for example, Moods and modal words) and replace each other (modal verbs, modal words, verbs and phrases of mental activity); and through them, various shades of a given meaning are expressed (assumption, confidence).

CHAPTER TWO. NOMINATIVE ASPECT OF MODAL WORDS IN THE MODERN ENGLISH LANGUAGE

2.1. Modal words as units of nomination

Studying the nominative aspect of modal words allows us to identify their specificity as nominative units of the language. It is known that they take part in the realization of the **nomination** of three types: simple, complex and through the text (or textual). As lexical units, modal words are simple (elemental) nominations. Relating to the sentence as a whole, they perform the function of a complex (event) nomination [Помахова, p. 56]. Used as reacting remarks and as part of dialogic unity, modal words are able to convey the reaction of the second communicant to the content of the situation, indicated by the initiating remark and uttered by the first communicant.

Using the analysis of vocabulary definitions and semantic analysis gave us the opportunity to derive two main types of modal words. The reason for assigning modal words to one or another semantic type is the presence of the general seme “rational assessment” and “emotional assessment” [Помахова, p. 68] in the structures of the lexical meaning of the modal words. The structure of the first type distinguishes between four sub-types, which are differentiated by the principle of the presence in the structures of the lexical meaning of modal words of particular invariant semes “confidence”, “evidence”, “probability” and “doubt”:

*By Descartes's time, science had become too powerful an instrument of knowledge for there **to be any possibility** of abandoning it and turning back the clock to the Middle Ages (Lawhead, p. 258).*

The second semantic type is divided into two sub-types depending on the presence in the structures of the lexical meaning of the modal words of particular invariant semes “positive assessment” and “negative assessment” [ibid, p. 69].

The variety of modal meanings, their grammatical synonymy, as well as the presence of a large number of classifications of types of modality at the lexical

level are some of the main inhibiting factors on the way to the competent use of modality, in particular, in a scientific text [Мильруд, p. 29].

In this subsection, in an attempt to systematize the accumulated material, we propose a classification of the types of modality of a scientific text. Defining the modality of a scientific text as the author's attitude to the content of a statement, J. Lyons expands the concept of "attitude", replacing it with the concept of "subjectivism" [Lyons, p. 78]. Subjectivism is understood as the author's involvement of his own "Self" in a scientific text (his desires, doubts, beliefs, etc.), so the subject is the source of modality. From this we can conclude that modality should not and cannot be limited only to modal verbs in a scientific text. "The linguistic means by which the author can express in the sentence not facts, but his attitude to them", in the Western methodological literature is often indicated by the term "**hedges**" [Hyland, p. 239], and in domestic linguistics they are called "**means of expressing modality**".

In the educational literature there are a large number of different classifications of not only types of modality, but also the means of their expression. Over the past 15 years, scientists have discovered that means of expressing modality can be [Fintel, p. 67]:

— modal verbs:

*In this picture, Descartes revolutionary ideas **could well be** just the inevitable outcome of the purposeless, neurochemical events in his brain* (Lawhead, p. 258).

— adjectives (possible, necessary):

*In other words, how **is it possible** for a spiritual substance and a physical substance to interact?* (Lawhead, p. 257)

— Participle II (alleged, demanded):

*Investigations into the **alleged** ill-treatment were reportedly dropped in the beginning of 1997* (Vold, p. 106).

— nouns (*probability*):

*Other empiricists such as John Locke were willing to accept mere **probability** in our knowledge of the external world, claiming that was all we needed to make it through life (Lawhead, p. 258).*

— verbs (*wonder, order*), adverbs (*perhaps, obviously*):

***It is probably** a fair generalization to state that the majority of psychologists and most philosophers think that Descartes got it wrong in his answer to this question (Lawhead, p. 259).*

— articles (*the, a*):

*A **possibility** is simply that he could have produced the idea himself (Lawhead, p. 251).*

— grammar tense (usually in the forms of Past Simple – I thought you’re in...):

*But it was just such taken-for-granted beliefs that Descartes **said were** subject to **doubt** no matter **how obvious they appeared** (Lawhead, p. 252).*

— subjunctive, conditional mood:

Hence, if I can have the idea of a perfect God, I must conclude that existence is one of his essential properties (Lawhead, p. 255).

— introductory phrases (hedging expressions):

*Furthermore, it seems strange that **Descartes finds it possible** to doubt that $2+3=5$, but cannot doubt the more complex and loaded metaphysical principle that “there must be at least as much reality in the total efficient cause as in its effect (Lawhead, p. 252).*

— emphatic *do, cannot help but*:

***One cannot help but wonder** if Bacon’s enthusiasm would have been diminished if he could have peeked into our age where the fruits of technology have also produced the poisonous seeds of nuclear destruction and environmental disasters (Lawhead, p. 231).*

— passive constructions with *get*:

Similarly, the influential thinkers in the fourteenth century **got convinced** of the limits of human reason and their philosophies were correspondingly modest in their aspirations (Lawhead, p. 209).

— tag questions:

*According to Descartes, these doubts undermine our certainty, **don't they?*** (Lawhead, p. 245)

— yes/no questions:

***Is it really possible** to doubt everything that I believe?* (Lawhead, p. 245)

***But can I doubt that** this is a book that I am reading?* (Lawhead, p. 245)

— intonation:

When he tries to doubt the proposition "I'm in doubt", he actually ends up in proving it! (Lawhead, p. 249)

This incomplete list clearly shows how diverse and 'subtle' the modality is in the English language.

Adding or changing just one word can change the modality of a sentence. For instance:

***Perhaps** this principle can be used as a bridge to obtain knowledge about the physical world* (Lawhead, p. 251).

***It is still possible** (though not plausible) to imagine that God leads me to be mistaken about things that seem obvious* (Lawhead, p. 251).

*I am finite and imperfect, and thus **I could not be** the cause of the idea of an infinite and perfect God* (Lawhead, p. 251).

*Nevertheless, **it is at least logically possible that** our entire world is a vast illusion and our most fundamental beliefs are all false* (Lawhead, p. 249).

The list goes on: changing only one means of expressing modality, we introduce a new modal meaning, a shade. Description and classification of the entire complex of modal shades is an extremely difficult (if at all feasible) task. Some scholars offer the following classification of modalities in English [Querler, p. 111]:

1. Epistemic modality (from Greek ‘episteme’ is ‘knowledge’). This type expresses the possibility, the likelihood of allegations in terms of facts.

2. Deontological modality (from Greek ‘deon’ is ‘duty’). It expresses what is possible, necessary or permitted in terms of law or moral principles.

3. The desired modality expresses the possibility or necessity in terms of the wishes of the author.

4. Dynamic modality expresses the possibility or necessity in terms of specific objective circumstances.

5. Teleological modality (from Greek ‘teleos’ is ‘goal’) expresses the possibility or necessity of something in terms of achieving the goal.

We have tried to adapt the general classifications of modalities to the scientific text. In this paragraph we give a brief description of the main types of modality in a scientific text.

According to the theme of our scientific work, **epistemic modality** and **hypothetical modality** most clearly reflect modal words as units of nomination. Thus, J. Lyons defined epistemic (evidence-based) modality as “any statement in which the speaker clearly defines the veracity of his statement, also acting as its guarantor” [Lyons, p. 2]. If any statement is evaluated from the point of view of reliability, then the degree of reliability will be measured by linguistic means of expressing epistemic modality (*perhaps, probably* etc.). Let us compare three sentences:

It’s possible that smoking causes lung cancer (Vold, p. 103).

In the first statement, we speak about **possibility**, i.e. the author denotes the physical (physiological) possibility that smoking can cause lung cancer. The author is confident in this possibility.

Smoking probably causes liver cancer (Vold, p. 104).

In the second sentence, the author speaks about **probability**, i.e. there is, in his opinion, the likelihood of cancer due to smoking. The author admits the probability of this.

We know that smoking causes throat cancer (Vold, p. 105).

The last sentence expresses *certainty*, i.e. the author claims confidence in a previously established causal relationship between cancer and smoking. Thus, if we construct these three sentences according to the degree of confidence, then we will have: the author (1) declares confidence, (2) is confident in the possibility and (3) allows for probability.

In fact, the range of epistemic modality can range from absolute certainty to complete uncertainty [Querler, p. 19]. The probability meaning can also be of varying degrees and is expressed in English by complex predicates with modal verbs *may, can, can't, would, might, should, ought to, be to, have to, will*:

*The problem is, however, if our minds can influence the physical world through our bodies, then much in the physical world **cannot be explained** by mechanistic science (Lawhead, p. 257).*

E.T. Vold defines the following features of the means of expressing epistemic modality by which this kind of modality can be found in the text [Мильтруд, p. 31]:

1. Language means should clearly and unambiguously express the veracity of a particular statement. The veracity of a particular statement (more precisely, its degree) should be maximally reflected by the means of expressing modality. The criterion for expressing truthfulness is very important, because, for example, the verbs *propose, assume* and *claim* that seem able to express epistemic modality, in fact, according to E.T. Vold, can only express a statement without confirming its veracity:

*We **assume** that suitably detailed indicator information is available (Vold, p. 99).*

2. The language means should be lexical or grammatical units. Let us consider a few examples of epistemic modality:

*As it has been discussed in the literature on relative clauses, gerundive relatives **seem to** have a reduced clausal structure when compared to full relatives (Vold, p. 96).*

In this sentence, *seem to* expresses a slight uncertainty about the veracity of the statement, which is supported by the subordinate clause *as it has been discussed in the literature on relative clauses*. However, if we remove *seem to*, we'll get a statement of a generally accepted fact or rule. Thus, *seem to* introduces a slight uncertainty into the statement.

*Our findings in non-smoking mothers suggest that the positive associations previously reported among first births **might** simply **reflect** inadequate adjustment for confounding variables* (Vold, p. 98).

In this sentence, on the contrary, the subordinate clause *our findings in non-smoking mothers suggest that* is evidence of doubt. This doubt is expressed by the modal verb *might*. The author is not sure, he doubts the veracity of the statement.

Epistemic modality can also be expressed in a scientific text through:

a) modal verbs (*must, could, might*):

*In the second case, our mental life is sucked into the clocklike physical universe, where everything **can be explained** deterministically in terms of particles in motion, as Hobbes believed* (Lawhead, p. 258).

b) adverbs (*maybe, perhaps, possibly, certainly, definitely, clearly, apparently, obviously*):

***Obviously**, only God would fully fit this description, since everything else depends on him* (Lawhead, p. 256).

c) constructions with an adjective (*it's doubtful that, it's clear that, it's apparent that, it's obvious that*). Let us illustrate this nomination with the following example:

***It seems obvious**, however, that making the pineal gland the location of the mind-body interaction still fails to explain how physical matter influences and is influenced by a spiritual substance* (Lawhead, p. 257).

The range of epistemic modality can be extremely broad, expressing the probability, possibility / impossibility or confidence of varying degrees. For instance:

Thus, the author clearly defines the degree of truthfulness of the statement or fact, which can act as a guarantor, and in the scientific text expresses it by means of epistemic modality.

The range of epistemological modality can be extremely broad, expressing the probability, possibility / impossibility or confidence of varying degrees. For instance:

*This sample **probably doesn't have** much significance (Lawhead, p. 250).*

*However, because he believed that Descartes's rational system was built on sand, Hume claimed that we **can't have** much in the way of knowledge (Lawhead, p. 258).*

***But if we assume** that a heat beam can bore the earth then... (Lawhead, p. 178).*

*It would be contradictory to say, "I can think of a perfect being who **necessarily** has the property of existence but who does not exist" (Lawhead, p. 153).*

Adding or changing some words in a sentence, we can see how the degree of confidence of the author changes.

It is also very important that the language means must clearly and unequivocally express the degree of truthfulness of a particular utterance. The reliability of any scientific utterance (its degree) will be measured by the linguistic means of expressing epistemic modality.

Hypothetical modality expresses the possibility of the author's statements (ideas, patterns) to become relevant or inappropriate to reality. Based on the facts (patterns discovered, etc.), the author of the statement considers the fact or action at the moment unreal (real), but possible (impossible) in the future. In other words, on the basis of a precedent (inference, analogy, etc.), the author makes an assumption about the reality (unreality) of something in the future (present) [Мильруд, p. 34]. This kind of modality is expressed in a scientific text via combinations with the modal verb *it might be, it could be*, as well as adverbs *probably, likely, apparently* and expressions as *in all likelihood*:

*According to our research, we conclude that **it might be** an alarming tendency increasing in the next week...* (Vold, p. 91).

*And so inevitably, you would transform yourself – irreversibly, **in all likelihood** – as you began this exploration* (Vold, p. 92).

In the first sentence, the author, based on his own research, hypothesizes the possibility of exacerbating the alarming tendency in the future. Thus, the author makes a prediction. The phrase *according to our research* guarantees that this forecast has a right to exist.

*The present fact suggests that this **could probably have been** because of a temporal reduction of oil output...* (Vold, p. 94).

In the above sentence, the author expresses a hypothesis, but not about the possibility of an action, but about the reasons that led to the fulfillment of this action in the past. Thus, an assumption is made about the causes of the action (fact). As in the first sentence, there is a phrase underlying the hypothesis *the present fact suggests that*. Both sentences begin with these phrases, which emphasizes the importance of the basic phrases of the hypothesis.

*These initiatives **might be** reset to fit in the present circumstances...* (Vold, p. 95).

This sentence is not about a forecast of something, but rather about an offer to do something. This proposal of the author to take action should, in his opinion, change the situation in the future. In general, the use of a hypothetical modality is possible when the author assumes the reality or unreality of the action on the basis of logical reasoning, own experience and factual information, etc.

Often a very difficult task is to determine the type of modality of a scientific text, when the same means of expression can be part of several types of modality. For example, the adverb *probably* can be present in both an epistemic and hypothetical modality. Let us take the example above: *Smoking **probably** causes lung cancer* (Vold, p. 100). A sample sentence with a hypothetical modality is also possible: *This **could probably have been** because of a temporal reduction of oil output* (Vold, p. 101).

A very common mistake of novice authors of scientific discourse is the inclusion of the meaning of desire as determining in the field of hypothetical modality. There is a danger of mistaking for the axiom that if the author puts forward a hypothesis, it means that he necessarily wants (does not want) the fulfillment (not the completion) of the action. In a scientific text, along with a hypothetical one, there is also a modality of desire [Мильтруд, p. 35].

The hypothetical modality has a significant difference from the modality of desire, where the author regrets the absence (excess) of something and expresses a desire to have (not) something. It is important not to combine these two types of modality [Hyland, p. 89]:

Hypothetical modality: “I have facts, and therefore, I think that perhaps X exists”. The reason – there are facts, the consequence – perhaps X exists.

Desirable modality: “I have no facts to think that X exists. I want facts, or I want X to exist”. The reason – there are no facts, the consequence – I want the facts to be and X exist.

Thus, a hypothetical modality expresses in a scientific text the possibility of an author’s statements (ideas, patterns) to become real (unreal) with respect to reality. Based on facts (patterns, etc.), the author considers the action (phenomenon) at the moment unreal (real), but possible (impossible) in the future. Based on a precedent (inference, analogy, etc.), the author makes an assumption about the reality (unreality) of something in the future (present). It is important not to confuse the hypothetical modality with the modality of desire, where the author regrets the absence (excess) of something and expresses a desire to have (not have) something.

2.2. Semantic types of modal words

The meaning of probability can be transmitted using lexical and grammatical means – modal words, as well as verbs and phrases of mental activity.

Modal words are characterized by V.V. Vinogradov as follows: “Modal words and particles determine the point of view of the speaking subject on the relation of speech to reality or on the choice and function of individual expressions in the composition of speech” [Виноградов, p. 328]. We will adhere to this definition in our work. V.V. Vinogradov identifies 12 main categories of modal words. To one of the categories he relates the words [ibid, p. 84]: “probably, understandable, undoubtedly, unconditionally, apparently, obviously, of course, maybe, really” and others that express a wide range of modal assessments from the fluctuating assessment of the reported fact to the logically sound definition of its reliability.

In most studies, on the material of various languages, two semantic groups of introductory-modal words and phrases are distinguished. The first group consists of modal words and phrases expressing the speaker’s conviction in the subject of the statement. In English, they include *surely, absolutely, sure, of course, certainly, naturally, indeed, really, exactly, undoubtedly, unmistakably, beyond all doubt, without fail, unquestionably, questionless, in fact, definitely, undubitably* [Горбунова, с. 88]. Using these words, the speaker seeks to emphasize the correctness of the judgment, categorical decision, the correct existence of the facts in question, i.e. that which cannot be doubted.

The second group includes modal words and phrases expressing uncertainty, doubt that the statements relate to them: *perhaps, probably, maybe, apparently, evidently, obviously, perchance, in all probability, most likely, presumably, most probably* [Горбунова, с. 89]. They are used when the speaker is not sufficiently knowledgeable about a particular message, cannot categorically affirm or deny what is being said.

Let us consider the features of using the category of modality ‘possibility-impossibility’ on the examples of modal words and verbs selected from text fragments belonging to different functional styles (scientific, journalistic and literary).

Modal verbs included in the microfields of possibility can express the speaker's assessment of the likelihood of a connection between an object and an attribute, i.e. epistemic modality:

It can hardly be denied that this sacramental point of view was a block to progress – progress in knowledge of how to control the environment and utilize it for this-worldly purposes (Lawhead, p. 210).

In combination with perfect infinitive, the modal verbs *can* and *may* appear in an epistemic meaning and express the assumption about the likelihood of a connection between an object and a subject in the past, i.e. evaluate the degree of probability / improbability of events preceding the moment of speech:

He could't have done it of his own free will. In his normal mind. It is unthinkable. (Fowels, p. 89)

Means of explication of epistemic modality include modal words, modal particles, modal phrases, syntactic constructions with modal meaning [Кошова, p. 14]. With all its lexical diversity, modal words that define the speaker's relation to the reliability of a statement can be divided into two main classes [Кошова, p. 15]:

1) words expressing confidence in the reliability of the facts stated (*certainly, surely, indeed, undoubtedly, etc.*):

Indeed, in James love of his children was now the prime motive of his existence (Galsworthy, p. 67).

2) words expressing only an assumption regarding the correspondence of a statement to reality (*probably, perhaps, maybe, etc.*). For instance:

Perhaps they regarded each other as an investment; certainly they were solicitous of each other's company (Galsworthy, p. 45).

The modal words that make up each of these classes are lexically heterogeneous. Along with the general, pivotal meaning characteristic of words of one category, each modal word has an individual connotation of meaning that defines it as a dictionary unity [Саидова, p. 162]. Modal words bring the meaning of confidence, assumption, as well as probability, doubt of the speaker. Grammatically, they are not parts of a sentence, but perform the role of an

introductory word in it. A modal word usually refers to the whole sentence and expresses the subjective attitude of the speaker to the expressed thought. For example: *perhaps, probably, may be, possibly* and others:

*Police are **probably** looking for her now, but so what* (Bradbury, p. 99)?

Grammatical means include modal verbs and forms of Mood. Modal verbs are used as auxiliary verbs with the main verbs as an indicator of a certain relationship, such as possibility, obligation, necessity, permission, etc. To modal verbs that convey different shades of possibility / impossibility, we refer the verbs *can (can not), could (could not), may (may not), might (might not)*. Modal verbs, not being an important part of speech, denote not the action or process itself, but the possibility or impossibility of their realization. Let us consider the functioning of modal verbs expressing the meaning of possibility in English.

The analysis of theoretical and practical material made it possible to identify the main zones of the category of possibility and impossibility in the English language, highlighting the core (possibility) and the periphery [Саидова, p. 162-163]

1. Probability (can, cannot/can't, must, ought to, should, will):

*You **must've had** the same dream!* (Bradbury, p. 100)

*All kinds of things **can go wrong** with people on that darn machine* (ibid, p. 78).

***Maybe** he **can** read lips* (Bradbury, p. 52).

Could, might, or may can be used to indicate the possibility of an event, including in the past:

*Tears **might have jumped** to his eyes* (Bradbury, p. 175).

2. Ability (can, could, be able to):

*They were like the ant, which **can see** small objects but not large one* (Fowles, p. 118).

3. Permission (can, could, may):

*He always asks me if he **may stay*** (Orwell, p. 61).

4. Negative possibility (might not and may not) is used to indicate the possibility of the untruth of the proposition:

*Say good-bye. Otherwise, I **might not let** you go* (Bradbury, p. 27).

*We can only read about them in books, and what it says in the books **may not be true*** (Fowles, p. 113).

5. Impossibility (could not and cannot) is used to indicate the impossibility of the truth of the proposition:

*You **can't read** my mind* (Bradbury, p. 91).

*But ... balloons **can't die**, can they?* (Bradbury, p. 95).

The verb *could not* can be used to indicate the impossibility of a greater degree of quality:

*I **couldn't care less*** (Orwell, p. 151).

6. Forbidden (cannot, may not, will not). The verb *cannot* can function as an indicator of prohibition, for example, due to the existence of a rule or law:

*But the old saying really applies: you **can't** get something for nothing* (Bradbury, p. 122).

The verb *may not* may appear in the same function:

*Dad, this is Willy, we **can't** go to the police station, we **may not be** home today, tell Mom, tell Jim's mom* (Bradbury, p. 100).

We can see that the modality of possibility / probability in English is most often conveyed by the modal verbs *can* and *may*. The verb *can* has the widest potential and can definitely be considered the dominant means of expressing possibility / impossibility in English. Depending on the communicative situation, this modal verb is able to transmit almost all the meanings of this field.

The considered differential semantic features of possibility of *can*, *may*, *will*, complementing each other, allow a relatively clear outline of the circle of the studied concept.

As a result of the analysis, we have come to the conclusion that the core of the functional and semantic field of possibility and impossibility in the English language is represented by the meaning of possibility, and the periphery – by the

meaning of probability, negative possibility, ability, impossibility, permission, forbidden. The above meanings are conveyed in the utterance by such lexical and grammatical means as modal words, modal verbs and forms of Mood.

The category of modality of possibility and impossibility, verbalized in newspaper articles, occupies a special place in the process of cognition of the objective world and, accordingly, is an important part of a void reality [Гатина, р. 89]. The significance of this category is reduced to the expression of a modal assessment in newspaper articles. The impact of the author of a journalistic article on the recipient by means of a specific text is provided through the use of language means, which, explicating semantic and pragmatic relations in the text, form its general modality [Ваулина, р. 9].

Modal means of possibility and impossibility, heterogeneous in their language expression, mark the attitude of the sender of information to the content of the message. This takes into account the possibility of transmitting author's knowledge about the situation of real or unreal reality in its assessment of the possibility or impossibility of the analyzed [Vaulina 1999]. When writing an article, the author resorts to various constructions that explicitly or implicitly reflect the possibility and impossibility, in particular grammatical constructions with modal verbs in the inference function. Information of such a plan is one of the constituent components of the semantic sphere of texts, due to which a field of possibility / impossibility is formed [Саркисян, р. 120].

Let us consider the ways of expressing the modality "possibility and impossibility" in English newspaper text fragments through constructions with modal verbs in the inference function:

*The precise manner in which the Government proposes to 'end' free movement is a pivotal aspect of the United Kingdom's approach to negotiations with the European Union and **could have** far-reaching consequences for the UK's future trading relationship with the EU (Peck, URL).*

In this example, the modal verb *could* in the inference function expresses the probability of an action in the future and serves to actualize the intention hidden by the author of the article. The expressive nature of this means of assumption has the function of influencing the reader. The author, having different means of influence, deliberately chooses *could*, thereby enhancing the effect of expectation and probability. The reader concludes about the possible consequences that may occur between the UK and the European Union.

In the following example, the modal verb *could* was used to express the possibility / impossibility, actualizing the author's intentions. The author gives the statement a high degree of probability on the issue of the overthrow or impeachment of an American president, thus enhancing the effect of influence on the reader:

The FBI disputing Donald Trump's claim Barack Obama had his telephones tapped during the election "could be a matter that brings down a president," a former CIA analyst has said. Dehumanized (Osborne, URL).

In the example, to express possibility / impossibility, the author uses the modal verbs *could* and *may*, synonymous in meaning. However, *could*, when compared, bears a greater degree of probability of Indian involvement in espionage. By means of *may*, the author questions the issue of installing surveillance cameras, thereby programming the reader in advance for the absurdity and improbability of the proposed action:

Pakistan has raised concerns that India's tallest ever flag, which can be seen from Lahore, could be used for "spying" Pakistan has complained to the Border Security Force and raised suspicions that hidden cameras may be installed on the flag pole for spying purposes (Khan, URL).

In the example, possibility / impossibility is verbalized in a construction with a modal verb in the inference function *may have*. The assumption presented in this language environment performs the function of actualizing hidden intentions. Based on the foregoing, the author makes his reader think about the possible causes of the death of Mr. Churkin, despite the preliminary version of heart failure:

*It was initially reported that Mr Churkin **may have suffered** a heart attack, but following an autopsy medical examiners said the death required further study (England, URL).*

In the example, possibility / impossibility is verbalized in a construction with a modal verb in a logical inference function *might have*. The author is skeptical about reporting the reasons that led the North Korean leader to a state of irritation. Anger, directly related to the behavior of the North Korean leader Kim Jong-un, may have led to the death of his half-brother. Thus, the assumption, objectified by the modal verb *might have* instead of *may*, serves to complicate the semantics of the statement and the impact on the reader. The author tries to show the audience the improbability of the information communicated. Therefore, by using *might have* instead of *may*, the author removes the categorical nature of the statement:

*Some in Seoul wonder if Kim Jong-un **might have become enraged** when a South Korean newspaper reported last week that Kim Jongnam tried to defect to the South in 2012. South Korea's spy service denied this, but it's still an open question (Klug, URL).*

In the following example, possibility / impossibility is verbalized in constructions with modal verbs (*may / could*) in a logic inference function, by means of which the author expresses probability, possibility of an action in the present (*may ... now*) or in the future (*could go a long way to...*):

*Japanese media quoted the government in Tokyo as saying those women **may now be dead**. None of this has been confirmed yet. Still, finding out who these women are and who hired them **could go a long way** to unlocking the mystery (Klug, URL).*

The explication of the modality “possibility / impossibility” using the modal verb *may* in combination with the lexeme *well* is of great interest. The author points to the low degree of probability or possibility of a specific solution to which the American administration has come in the issue of the Syrian conflict. In the eyes of the American administration, the hypothetical picture of obstructing the

regime of Bashar Hafez al-Assad may end in bloodshed. Thus, these means of explicating possibilities / impossibilities create the pragmatic potential of the text and increase the impact on the reader.

In the example, the modal meaning “possibility / impossibility” is realized in a lexico-grammatical way. The core means of explication of possibility / impossibility are the persuasive lexeme *suggest* and the phrase *more likely*. At the grammatical level, possibility / impossibility is represented in a construction with the modal verb *may* as a function of logical inference. This verb expresses the likelihood of an action in the present. Language means of explication create the pragmatic potential of the text and, accordingly, enhance the effectiveness of the impact on the reader:

*Mr Trump may be trying to divert attention from controversy surrounding him Twitter. In what was either an attempt to raise a laugh, or **more likely** distract attention from his own woes, Donald Trump **has suggested** that Chuck Schumer should be investigated for his links to Russia (Buncombe, URL).*

As we can see, the author illustrates the likelihood of the president’s actions in an attempt to divert public attention from his own troubles, mainly related to the issue of eavesdropping. By combining the persuasive lexeme *suggest* and the modal verb *should*, the author not only expresses the probability of the proposed actions on the part of Trump, but rather illustrates the conditionally hypothetical situation where Trump insistently calls on the public to thoroughly investigate the Chuck Schumer case regarding his relationship with Russia. Thus, the “possibility / impossibility” modality fulfills the function of influencing the reader.

Thus, based on the analysis of the language material, it has been concluded that the modal meaning “possibility / impossibility” in the framework of newspaper articles carries a pragmatic load, i.e. it is an author’s influence on the readership. However, influence occurs veiled. So, the author of the article presents the material using the language in such a way as to have the maximum impact on the reader’s worldview.

Modal verbs in the literary context act as indicators of probability, the degree of conviction of the hero and thereby fulfill their main function – they demonstrate the speaker’s knowledge at the time of speech, allowing him to make certain assumptions or conclusions regarding the likelihood of a future event [Сухомлина, p. 85]. Let us consider the modal verb *may*, which expresses a positive probabilistic cognitive position indirectly or implicitly. For instance:

*It **may be** mere superstition, it may be some potent curse from the past that operates in ways undreamed of by modern science* (Christie, p. 122).

In the given example, the speaker puts forward an alternative to assumptions and provides each of its variants with the modal verb *may* in a probabilistic sense. The specificity of the meaning of assumption is such that the probability ratio of the alternatives is uncertain. This automatically implies the dubious and hypothetical nature of each option. Thus, the explicit assumption via the modal verb *may* contains a positive probabilistic position regarding both alternatives.

In the following example, the speaker assumes that the interlocutor considers him stupid and overly trusting. The assumption here also implicates the future tense, although attention is not so clearly focused on it as in the previous example:

*You **may think** me foolish, credulous woman, but, Monsieur Poirot, I am afraid* (Christie, p. 78).

It is necessary to note that the modal verb *might* occurs in rare cases in monological speech and expresses a low degree of probability of an event in the future. It should be added that its use is most often observed in colloquial speech:

*I suppose he **might** know that, but he never said anything* (Christie, p. 102).

*He **might be** weak or wild. He **might get** into debt or get mixed up in a scandal. But pushing someone over cliff ...* (Christie, p. 67).

The study showed that in the probabilistic meaning with the semantics of the future tense, similar to the verb *may*, the modal verbs *can* and *could* are used. Let us consider the following example:

***Could I condemn** him for feelings with which I myself had burned all those years ago? **Could I celebrate** his loss when it had been mine as well, or*

congratulate myself for having been spared the tor-ment he had known while living in the twisted ineffectual body of the Pharaoh who could never possess his beautiful bride? (Boyd, p. 95).

The above illustrative fragment of the literary text shows that the modal verb *could* with the meaning of assumption is part of the rhetorical question. The whole statement (self-addressed) is formed by complex sentences. It should be noted that the rhetorical question in the example does not intend to request information. Its task is to find confirmation of the assumption expressed in it and to provide a basis for reflection.

In rare cases, in the probabilistic meaning with the semantics of the future tense, the verb *should* is sometimes used in monological speech. Although this study shows that it most often occurs in colloquial speech [Сухомлина, p. 85]:

*When you say tell her I'm not at home, do you mean that I **should go out** and say so? Or that I **should tell** Luci to tell her aunt so?* (Christie, p. 56).

As for the modal verb *must*, in monological texts in probabilistic meaning it implies the prevalence of a positive share of doubt over negative one in probabilistic terms from a cognitive point of view [Сухомлина, p. 86]. We will give an example of the stated above:

*Oh, you really **mustn't say** that. Isn't it natural that I should have a certain delicacy in talking to my old friend's daughter about her behind her back?* (Shaw, p. 64).

In this fragment, the hero is sure that he should not reveal the secret. This is expressed in the fact that he uses the modal verb *must* with the semantics of the future tense. His statement aims to dispel recent doubts about the decision of his actions.

As for **modal words**, the peculiarity of the semantics of the future tense is that it expresses the characterization of the character. In addition, the choice of a modal word depends on the qualities of the hero, on his ability to control the situation. Thus, the future in such situations becomes a predictable, logically justified statement available to the hero, i.e. information about the event, derived

from a number of parameters and background knowledge [Сухомлина, p. 87]. As an example, let us consider the modal word *perhaps*. It is most often found in monologue speech and states insufficient background knowledge of the hero about the situation and state of things:

Perhaps we should extinguish the lamps (Boyd, p. 81).

The semantics of the modal word *probably* includes a component of future reference, hypothetical. At the same time, the onset of a certain situation in the future in this context is rationally explainable [ibid, p. 88]. Although the character in this case has certain knowledge regarding the nature and properties of his actions, he still cannot be sure of the true motives of his actions, nor does he have information on the immediate cause of this or that action:

He'll probably stick around for a few hours checking for a lead on the forger (Christie, p. 96).

It is important to note that the use of modal words in a probabilistic sense is equivalent to modal verbs. An example is the following fragment with the modal word *possibly*:

“Four whole days I seem to have lost out of my life”, he said. “Very curious. Really very curious indeed. I wonder so much where I was and what I was doing. The doctor tells me it may all come back to me. On the other hand it may not. Possibly shall never know what happened to me during those days” (Christie, p. 37).

As the analysis of factual material shows, the described modal meanings of obligation, permission, desire, transmitted by a combination of modal verbs *must, should, can / could, may / might* with the infinitive, as well as modal words, are the main means of explicating the subjective attitude of the hero to the content of the context. They most often appear in the literary context as a means of expressing probability and degree of conviction of the hero and demonstrate the speaker's knowledge at the time of the speech, allowing him to make his own assumptions about the likelihood of a future situation. Modal verbs and words with the semantics of the future tense, used in literary monological speech, acquire new

meanings and become dependent on the speech situation, as well as the purpose of the statement.

Conclusions to Chapter Two

The most common definition of language modality comes down to the fact that this category expresses the relationship of the message to reality from the point of view of the speaker. Modality encompasses those grammatical means that have been developed thanks to the purpose of the language as a means of communication and ensure the accessibility and effectiveness of the thought informed. Modality is primarily manifested in the sentence. Modality is conveyed by all meanings and shades expressed by synthetic and analytical forms of Mood of the verb. In other words, it is a functional and semantic category that expresses different types of the relation of the utterance to reality, as well as different types of subjective qualifications of the communicated. It is a language universal that belongs to the main categories of natural language.

Modality is differentiated into objective and subjective. Subjective modality, in contrast to the objective one, is an optional feature of expression and is expressed by such means as word order, intonation, lexical repetitions, modal words and verbs, exclamations, parenthetic words and phrases, parenthetic sentences, word order in a sentence.

The meaning common to all modal words is the expression of the evaluation of the utterance by the subject. Within the general meaning of the assessment, modal words express two particular meanings: rational and emotional assessment. This serves as the basis for the derivation of two semantic types of modal words with a number of subtypes. Consideration of modal words in the aspect of the theory of language nomination shows that they participate in the realization of three types of nomination: simple, complex and textual. As lexical units, modal words are simple (elemental) nominations. Relating to the sentence as a whole, they perform a function of a complex (event) nomination.

Modality encompasses those grammatical means that have been developed, thanks to the function of language as a means of communication, ensuring the accessibility and effectiveness of the thought informed. The lexico-grammatical means of expressing modality in English are modal verbs, modal words and forms of Mood. Modal verbs in a communication situation are used in both primary and secondary functions. The expression of modality in a communication situation using modal words and the subjunctive mood is the most specific to use. The use of modality in a communication situation is necessary in order to express one's own opinion, predict probable / unlikely actions or influence events.

CHAPTER THREE. COMMUNICATIVE AND PRAGMATIC CHARACTERISTICS OF MODAL WORDS

3.1. Modal words of probability as a means of expressing modality in dialogical speech. Modal words as modifiers of speech acts

The study of the means of expressing modality using the future tense in colloquial speech is aimed at describing the choice of a speech marker in the process of communication of characters, on the one hand, and in creating conditions for mutual understanding, on the other (Hermeren, p. 104). Researchers can see in modal words in general and in modal verbs, in particular, the main means of softening illocution (speech act), since they perform the function of predicting various types of logical and practical possibility of an event's realization (Давиденко, p. 86).

Modal verbs, used as a means of softening the categorical statement, act in their secondary function, which is expressed in a certain gap between the semantic and pragmatic meaning of speech formulas. Thus, the modal verb *must* expresses a logical inference that is based on specific facts and can be deduced as a result of logical reasoning, while the modal verb *should* means an assumption based on the expectation of a certain event, the verification of which is possible only in the future. For example:

*“I sickened at the thought of the long course of cruelty and neglect which **must** have occurred to produce such an impression on such a man”* (Dickens, p. 62); *“I **should** if their aunt wasn't here”, replied the ready Pickwickian with a passionate glance* (Dickens, p. 79).

In the second fragment, the likelihood of the meaning of the modal verb *should* is expressed in Mr. Tupman's witty response to Rachel's question about the attractiveness of her nieces. The resourceful Pickwickist suggested that this was possible, thereby complimenting the girls' aunt.

One of the main means of expressing the future tense in terms of the modality of speech are modal verbs with the meaning of probability. We have identified that the most common case in colloquial speech is the use of the *must* verb in a probabilistic sense:

*Don't forget we **must** talk to Felicity about her future. – **Must** we? – Why do you say “**must** we” in that peculiar tone of voice? (Murdoch, p. 9).*

In this example, in the process of speaking, the character overestimates the current situation and over-dramatizes it. In the following example, this is about the opportunity to make room for the ladies a little by letting a fat gentleman into the carriage:

*“Now, we **must** sit close”, said the stout gentleman (Dickens, p. 77).*

A significant strengthening of the assumption based on the repetition of modal statements is accompanied by an emotional assessment of the truth of the hero's argument.

A high degree of confidence in the semantics of the future, similar to the modal verb *must*, is also found in the following example of colloquial speech, where the emotionally reinforcing meaning of the expression with the verb *ought to* comes to the fore to reflect the state of the character:

*Clark, who on the earth **shall** I marry? – I offer my services.... – Honey, you **couldn't** support a wife. – It doesn't mean you **ought to** marry a Yankee. – **Supposingly** I love him. – You **couldn't**. (Fitzgerald, p. 74).*

Analysis of the factual material showed that similar to the modal verb *must* in terms of expressing the semantics of the probability of an action, the modal verb *might* is also widely used in literary colloquial speech. Let us consider the following examples:

*“However well deserved this piece of retaliation **might be**, it is as vindictive a one as could well be resorted to” (Dickens, p. 80); You will not've toasts to start with? – No. You don't want toast, do you, Fanny? – Oh, no, thank you, George. – Oh **perhaps** the lady **might** like to look at the live lobsters in the tank*

while the tea is coming? (Mansfield, p. 214); *Will you come to see me take a bath?* – *I might* (Milne, p. 54).

The first fragment deals with the possibility or probability of the so-called revenge on the aunt from the nieces Emily and Isabella in response to her spite in their direction in order to attract the attention of Mr. Tupman. In the following fragment, the future tense, expressed by the modal verb *might*, has the same hypothesis semantics in cues. But in one example of dialogue, the cognitive position of probability has a negative connotation. The character's father could say a phrase with the semantics of the future, but such an answer could upset the kid, so for ethical reasons he chooses the mild form *I might*. It is important to note that such an epistemic state is understandable to the character, since we can clearly see Robin's doubts that his father will fulfill his request.

The modal verb *may* expresses the possibility of an event based on the speaker's subjective assumption. J. Leech explains this semantic difference by the distinction between theoretical and factual possibility (Leech, p. 75 – 77):

“We may place our men, then, I think”, observed the officer with as much indifference as if the principals were chess-men and the seconds players.

“I think we may”, replied Mr. Snodgrass, who would have assented to any proposition because he knew nothing about the matter (Dickens, p. 53).

The fragment is about duelists, i.e. about the probability of their possible correct location on the ground in order to get the best result of the match or duel for one of the parties.

In dialogical speech, the modal verb *may* is used on rare occasions in the meaning of the assumption of a future event. As a rule, the number of examples is limited, since the assumption in such cases grows into conviction (Kroeger, p. 99). This is confirmed by the following example of an excerpt from a dialogue:

Where's Richard? – I have no idea, he may be anywhere now (Hicks, p. 73)

Here we can observe that the speaker has no idea where Richard is. The absence of an assumption implies the hero's conviction in his opinion. The

character uses the modal verb *may* in his speech, implying probabilistic forecasting with an element of conviction.

As for the meaning of the modal verb *can / could*, it denotes the subjective ability of the character to perform any actions in the future in the context of colloquial speech:

“What’s the matter?” cried Mr. Tupman as a load knocking at his door roused him from his oblivious repose.

“Can I speak to Mr. Winkle, sir?” replied the Boots from the outside (Dickens, p. 46).

In the fragment, the doorman tries to reach out to Mr. Winkle, angering Mr. Tupman, who is fast asleep in his room.

“Can anything be finer or more delightful?” he inquired of Mr. Winkle.

“Nothing”, replied that gentleman, who had had a short man standing on each of his feet for the quarter of an hour immediately preceding (Dickens, p. 71).

In the passage, through the modal verb *can* Mr. Winkle expresses admiration for the field maneuvers of the troops, the excellent performance of the marches by military bands, and the crowd, who were delighted with the whole action.

It should be noted that the modal verb *can / could* is a polysemantic verb, the semantics of which is distributed depending on the contextual conditions of its use. This verb expresses the meanings of indicating the abilities or characteristics of the subject of the proposition – innate or acquired, manifested constantly or under the influence of certain circumstances, i.e. internal capabilities; external opportunities that allow the changes taking place with the subject; epistemic, i.e. subjective judgments of the producer of speech about the subject of the proposition and the likelihood or possibility of performing certain actions or activities, etc. Such verbs are often used in interrogative sentences to express the speaker’s doubt (Kroeger, p. 109). Let us consider the following example of how the modal *could* functions:

*It’s extraordinary how men like helpless women. – I don’t think Moira is particularly helpless, said Bobby. – Nonsense. She’s like a little bird that sits and waits to be eaten by a snake without doing anything about it. – What **could** she do?*

(Christie, p. 85); “*I could say nothing in reply; for who could offer hope or consolation to the abject being before me?*” (Dickens, p. 62-63)

In the first fragment, the hero’s last remark expresses a subjective ability, expressed by doubt that Moira has the ability to do anything under the circumstances. In the second fragment, the wandering actor does not find (it is possible / probable to give the desired answer) what to answer to a cruel man who has tortured his own wife all his life. In a rhetorical question addressed to everyone, the actor only asks about the likelihood of the existence of such a person who would dare to console such a scoundrel.

An analysis of the factual material shows that the combination of the modal verbs *can / could* with negation implies the hero’s conviction in the upcoming events due to a specific communicative situation (Keynes, p. 209). For example:

“*he acts in the piece that the officers of the Fifty-second get up at the Rochester Theatre to-morrow night. You cannot proceed in this affair, Slammer – impossible!*” (Dickens, p. 67); *You can’t possibly wear that, Mother ... – Well, I like it, anyway, and I’m going to wear it... – Mother, it’s awful. You can’t wear it* (Durrell, p. 47).

In the first fragment, the lieutenant expresses doubt about the upcoming duel, arguing that the wandering actor cannot be a worthy partner for Dr. Slammer. In the second example, Margot expresses disbelief that the mother would dare to wear an ugly robe. In order to persuade the mother to abandon an unreasonable intention, the daughter uses the categorical form *You can’t* twice instead of the less categorical one. Thus, the use of the modal verb *can’t* with the semantics of the future tense expresses the girl’s conviction in the upcoming events and carries an element of emphatic hyperbolization.

The modal verb *can* in the meaning of an assumption reflects the possibility of an event based on the intrinsic properties of the object itself:

“*Stay, sir*”, said Mr. Pickwick. “*I really cannot allow this matter to go any further without some explanation. Tupman, recount the circumstances*” (Dickens, p. 67).

In the passage, Mr. Pickwick expresses his opinion about preventing the development of the story with a duel, until he listens to everything as it really was.

As for the modal verb *should*, it has a single character of use in colloquial speech and carries the meaning of the probability of events occurring in the future (Murphy, p. 126):

*I can go if you think it necessary. – Certainly I think it necessary. Even if there is nothing, we can have peace of mind. Certainly I think it necessary. I **should** like Doctor Wayne to come this evening **if possible*** (Lawrence, p. 175).

In the above example, in the reply of the father-in-law, it is clear that the verb *should* with the semantics of the future reveals the need to seek advice from Dr. Wayne. In addition, the repetition of the initiating remark presupposes the value judgment of the character's remark, which contributes to the strengthening of the emotional impact on the reader.

During the study of artistic material, it has been found that in the process of building communication, modality and assessment correlate with the future tense and form the aesthetic aspect of the perception of dialogical speech, which is expressed in the interweaving of various means of expressing the future tense within the dialogue (Wright, p. 109). For example, let us consider the following dialogue:

*He took out a healthy kidney and left in a diseased one! The man **should** be put in jail! – Paige, I agree with you that's regrettable. But it certainly wasn't intentional. It was a mistake. – A mistake? That patient **is going to** have to live on dialysis for the rest of his life. Someone **should** pay for that. – Believe me, we're **going to** have a peer review evaluation* (Sheldon, p. 133).

In this dialogue, Taylor's statements, containing various means of expressing the future tense *should*, *to be going to*, convey the general emotional meaning of her surprise and indignation as a senior surgeon. Wallace's subsequent statement clarifies the meaning of the topic under discussion. Thus, in the passage under consideration, all statements are united by a correlative link, which indicates the mutual direction of the interlocutors' speech communication.

Therefore, as the analysis of texts selected from fiction, in particular from the works by classics of British and American literature, such as Ch. Dickens, I. Murdoch, F. Fitzgerald, K. Mansfield, A. Milne, K. Hicks, G. Durrell, D. Lawrence, S. Sheldon showed, the actualization of the use of lexico-grammatical means expressed by modal verbs *must, can / could, may / might, should, ought to* with the meaning of probability and possibility is a consequence of the author's desire to convey various shades of the future and to give the most accurate description of the characters. The means in colloquial speech described above, in most cases, are of a mixed modal and evaluative nature. Thus, informative and emotive information is leading in communication, which contributes to a literary text that appears quasi live spoken speech.

For pragmatic purposes, the modality of reality is replaced by the modality of supposition with the help of modal modifier words (pragmatic markers) *perhaps, probably, possibly, maybe, by (any) chance* with the meaning of doubt, presumption or probability:

*"I was about to observe, sir", he said, "that though my apparel would be too large, a suit of my friend Mr. Winkle's would **perhaps** fit you better".*

The stranger took Mr. Winkle's measure with his eye, and that feature glistened with satisfaction as he said: "Just the thing" (Dickens, p. 40).

In the passage, Mr. Taupman advises a stranger to use the suit of his friend, Mr. Winkle, which is likely to suit him in size (while the counselor himself is a bit fat).

The use of these linguistic units in stimulating speech acts introduces into the statement an element of doubt about the real possibility (in speech acts of a request) or the need (in speech acts of advice) to implement the prompted action and reduces the degree of influence on the addressee. Moreover, the greater the proportion of doubt, the lower the degree of impositivity of the statement.

The adverb *hardly* also introduces the shade of uncertainty, which can be considered as an exponent of subjective modality, since it introduces various

semantic shades into the sentence, and also expresses the speaker's attitude and feelings to the communicated. For example:

"I – I – really think they are", urged Mr. Snodgrass, somewhat alarmed.

*"Impossible. He had **hardly** uttered the word when the whole half-dozen regiments levelled their muskets as if they had but one common object ..."* (Dickens, p. 72).

In the fragment, Mr. Pickwick expresses his opinion on the impossibility of military regiments to target at the crowd of the Pickwick Club. In the relevant context, *hardly* is used as a function of semantic negation, which is more polite than complete, categorical, direct and explicit negation.

All of the above methods of minimizing impositivity (imposition) in statements can be used both in isolation and in conjunction with others within the same statement. So, in order to maximize the softening of the categorical judgment, it is possible to use several means of modality at the same time, for example:

*"My friend Doctor Slammer requested me to add that he was firmly persuaded you were intoxicated during a portion of the evening, and **possibly** unconscious of the extent of the insult you were guilty of"* (Dickens, p. 47); *"Or **possibly**", said the man with the camp-stool, "the gentleman's second **may** feel himself affronted with some observations which fell from me at an early period of this meeting; if so, I shall be happy to give him satisfaction immediately"* (Dickens, p. 55).

In the first passage, Dr. Slammer's friend, by using the adverb of probability *possibly* expresses a non-categorical judgment about the guilt of Mr. Winkle, who allegedly insulted the doctor (referring to his intoxication). In the second example, non-categorical judgment is manifested in the use of the modal verb *may*.

Thanks to the rich system of means of expressing modality, one and the same intention can be expressed in the English language by various speech formulas, of which there are often several (Palmer, p. 67). In the above sentences, the request is expressed indirectly using the following means of modality:

question, modal verb, subjunctive mood, units *possibly*, *perhaps*. The following statements can serve as an illustration of the above:

“*We have some friends here*”, replied Mr. Winkle, “*and I should not like to leave them to-night. Perhaps you and your friend will join us at the Bull*” (Dickens, p. 56); “*If I could have entertained any doubt of it for an instant, one glance at the woman’s pale face and wasted form would have sufficiently explained the real state of the case. ‘You had better stand aside’, said I to the poor creature. ‘You can do him no good. Perhaps he will be calmer if he does not see you’* (Dickens, p. 62).

In accordance with the first dictionary meaning, in a number of works the adverb *evidently* is described as an indicator of the speaker’s confidence in a high degree of reliability of the information reported. However, there are studies in which *evidently* is described as an indicator of problematic authenticity (Chafe, p. 263). For example, the incomplete confidence of the speaker using *evidently* in his utterance is pointed out by W. Chafe (Chafe, p. 265), comparing it with the verb *seem*:

“*Evidently a traveller in many countries, and a close observer of men and things*”, said Mr. Pickwick.

“*I should like to see his poem*”, said Mr. Snodgrass (Dickens, p. 37).

In the passage, Mr. Pickwick suggests that the stranger in the green tailcoat probably visited many countries around the world, where he closely had observed people and events, judging by his statements and impressions.

Thus, the softening of the categorical meaning of the utterance is the basic form in which the constituents of the modality field implement the principle of minimizing imposition in motivating speech acts. The foregoing indicates the presence of special components of meaning in the semantics of modal verbs, modal words and phrases, which can be defined as cognitive-pragmatic.

Their role in the structure of modal predication and in the utterance is that the modal units of the language make the utterance less categorical. They can be viewed as forms, arranged in a gradual way according to the degree of intensity of

expression of illocutionary force and ultimately determining the degree of politeness of the statement. A wide range of subjectively colored semantics of the constituents of the modality field enables the speaker to convey many pragmatic shades when conveying information, expressing a request, advice, demand or proposal, to demonstrate his or her attitude to a communication partner, a different degree of closeness in communication, a different degree of urgency of the prompted action, and certainty / uncertainty about the truth / veracity of the reported.

3.2. Pragmatic probability markers in monological texts

Monologue speech, in our understanding, denotes a way of narration, characteristic primarily of a literary text. In addition, the meaning of each modal word has its own semantic peculiarities. For example:

Supposingly he still wants the Queen to feel falsely secure? (Dickens, p. 113); He was wholly unacquainted with the place and its inhabitants; and the stranger *seemed to* possess as great a knowledge of both as if he had lived there from his infancy (Dickens, p. 40); He *seemingly* endeavoured to collect his thoughts for a few seconds ... (Dickens, p. 61-62); ... for the fat boy was hanging fondly over a capon, which he was *seemingly* wholly unable to part with (Dickens, p. 78).

In the fragments, the word *supposing(ly)* means ‘conscious positing’ and implies a certain amount of rational doubt. Whereas the word *seemingly* means ‘intuitive belief’ and a certain amount of doubt based on intuition.

Typically, monologue is the sphere of such areas as art and education, also a classic example of it is a public speaking at a conference or other public speech (Langacker, p. 347). Speaking on television or radio is also a classic example of a monologue speech, as well as the author’s monologues in a literary work, revealing the character of a hero:

*A casual observer, adds the secretary, to whose notes we are indebted for the following account – a casual observer **might possibly** have remarked nothing extraordinary in the bald head and circular spectacles ... (Dickens, p. 25); his elevated position revealing those tights and gaiters which, had they clothed an ordinary man, **might** have passed without observation ... (Dickens, p. 25); ... a lady of doubtful age, **probably** the aunt of the aforesaid... (Dickens, p. 75).*

In the fragments, the probability of the author's attitude to certain situations, events and characters is expressed with the help of both the modal verb *might* and the modal adverbs of probability *probably* and *possibly*.

It should be noted that the future tense is very dependent on the subjective opinion of the author of a literary text. Therefore, the expression of events and actions in the future is clearly represented in lexical and grammatical forms against the background of modal meaning:

*In his better days, before he had become enfeebled by dissipation and emaciated by disease, he had been in the receipt of a good salary, which, if he had been careful and prudent, he **might** have continued to receive for some years ... (Dickens, p. 59).*

In the passage, the traveling actor speculates that his fellow worker, a small pantomime actor, would continue to receive a good salary for several more years. Not many, because people of this profession die early or lose premature physical strength, on which their very existence depends.

Since the nature of the future tense category lies in the speaker's assessment of the situation and in the expression of subjective opinion, reflection, as well as in the designation of his own position in relation to the described event or fact, the modal dominant of the future tense expression forms is leading:

*We **are** merely **endeavouring** to discharge in an upright manner the responsible duties of our editorial functions; ... The Pickwick Papers are our New River Head, and we **may** be compared to the New River Company (Dickens, p. 69).*

In a fragment, with the help of a progressive tense form and a modal verb *may*, that additional component of meaning is formed that the author wants to compell the reader, so that the latter interprets the information for himself in the form of the writer's ideas.

Modal verbs and words used in literary monologue speech acquire new meanings and become dependent on the speech situation, as well as the purpose of the statement. The choice of the lexical and grammatical means depends on the situation of the plot narration, i.e. on the semantic meaning to be expressed in addition to the temporary designation of the context. In other words, the category of verb modality plays an important role in expressing the semantic meaning of a work of art:

*A vast deal of coolness and a peculiar degree of judgement are requisite in catching a hat. A man **must** not be precipitate, or he runs over it; he **must** not rush into the opposite extreme, or he loses it altogether* (Dickens, p. 74).

In the fragment, with the help of the modal verb *must*, Mr. Pickwick's pursuit of his own hat is ironically played out. Besides, the tactics and strategies of the character's behavior used to obtain positive results in this case are defined and described.

Description of the present or future tense as a temporary form of artistic narration contributes to understanding and explaining the representation of its various means of expression, orienting the reader regarding the described temporary events in the text (Langacker, p. 348), and is also aimed at comprehending its originality in order to be able to read between the lines:

*Man is but mortal, and there is a point beyond which human courage **cannot** extend* (Dickens, p. 73).

In the passage, the author's digression concerns philosophical reflections on the fragility of human nature, which is not limitless in its weakness (ironically, it is about the notorious courage of Mr. Pickwick).

At the lexical and grammatical level, the most common means of expressing subjective modality are modal words. Modal words in essence express the possibility or impossibility of action, probability or improbability, doubt, etc.:

*He was **apparently** about to proceed to do so when Lieutenant Tappleton, who had been eyeing him with great curiosity....* (Dickens, p. 67).

In the fragment, despite the fact that the adverb *apparently* is a full-fledged part of a sentence, its function is the expression of subjective assessment. The author evaluates the qualities of objects or the emotional state of other people, and these conclusions are probabilistic in nature.

The primary function of modal verbs is to verbalize, mark the author's psychological emotional state, attitude to the communicative situation and its components, soften the categorical meaning of functional verbs:

*He (Mr. Pickwick) would not deny that he was influenced by human passions and human feelings (cheers) – **possibly** by human weaknesses – (loud cries of 'No') ...* (Dickens, p. 25).

In the fragment, the syntactic level of modality in English-language political speeches is expressed by the parenthetical phrase *possibly by human weaknesses* with the meaning of uncertainty or doubt.

The meaning inherent in English modal verbs in a literary monologue is the assumption, uncertainty or / and probability of action, for example:

*"The consumption of tobacco in these towns" (continues Mr. Pickwick) "must be very great, and the smell which pervades the streets **must be** exceedingly delicious to those who are extremely fond of smoking. A superficial traveller **might** object to the dirt which is their leading characteristic..."; He had divested himself of his brown-paper parcel, but had made no alteration in his attire; and was, **if possible**, more loquacious than ever* (Dickens, p. 37-38).

In the fragment, the probability is expressed by modal verbs and adjectives such as *must, might* and *if possible*.

Modal verbs, which represent an action as possible or impossible, definite or doubtful, probable etc., are considered additional means of expressing the

speaker's attitude to the action in the sentence (Kratzer, 640). Thus, the popularity of modal verbs during the proclamation of political speeches is quite natural:

*Women are not allowed to attend school. You **can** be jailed for owning a television. Religion **can** be practiced only as their leaders dictate. A man **can** be jailed in Afghanistan if his beard is not long enough (SRT, IR).*

In the fragment, modality is realized through the repetition of statements with the modal verb *can* – *can be jailed, (religion) can be practiced*. The frequent use of modal verbs in the political speeches of US politicians is due to their ability to present the statement as reasonable, possible, and regulate the modality of the whole statement, preparing the mind of the addressee and signaling the intentions and wishes of the politician. They have an imperative character and acquire increased ideological significance in political communication.

Conditional sentences in the speeches of US politicians are based on a system of argumentation and have a modal meaning in this context:

***If that happens** without consequence in Ukraine, **it could happen** to any nation gathered here today (RBPO, IR).*

In argumentation, American politicians use formulas of rhetorical generalization, when different opinions are replaced by one, allegedly generalizing them:

***Obviously**, the strength of nations depends on the success of their people – their knowledge, their innovation, their imagination, their creativity, their drive, their opportunity – and that, in turn, depends upon individual rights and good governance and personal security (RBPO, IR).*

In the passage, the adverb *obviously* at the beginning of the sentence performs a generalizing function, propagating the meaning of the passage, which states that the strength of countries depends on the success of people, i.e. their knowledge, innovations, imagination, creativity and ability. All this, in turn, can not exist without respect for individual rights, proper management and guarantees of personal safety.

An important place in the arguments of American politicians are references to authoritative opinions and the technique of concretization. Since the US Congress is an institution of power, the main function of which is legislative, among the references to authoritative opinions are quotes from regulations:

*The United States is grateful that many nations and many international organizations have already responded – with sympathy and with support. Nations from Latin America, to Asia, to Africa, to Europe, to the Islamic world. **Perhaps** the NATO Charter reflects best the attitude of the world: An attack on one is an attack on all (SRT, IR).*

In the passage, George W. Bush refers to the North Atlantic Treaty, an international agreement reached on April 4, 1949 in Washington, DC, by Western European and North American countries to unite efforts for collective defense, peace and security in the North Atlantic. The treaty became the founding document of the North Atlantic Alliance, in which one of the articles states that “an attack on one is an attack on all”.

A means of expressing the function of representing an action as *possible / impossible* in the discourse of political speeches is the modal verb *can*, which in combination with the infinitive of the main verb expresses the physical ability, skill or ability to do something, for example:

*As Commander in Chief, I **can** report to you our armed forces fought with honor and valor. And as President, I **can** report to the Nation aggression is defeated. The war is over (PSA: URL); Making these savings will mean we **can** afford to spend money on things that really matter (BPS: URL); And so, my fellow Americans, ask not what your country **can** do for you; ask what you **can** do for your country (PSA: URL).*

In the first fragment, George W. Bush talks about ending the Gulf War. In the second passage, Nick Clegg argues that the government will be able to spend money on important things if it saves them properly. In the third passage, President J.F. Kennedy emphasizes that just as the United States has the ability to do

something for its people, so do Americans have the ability to do something for their country.

These examples demonstrate that the verb *can* in the sense of physical ability or skill can also refer to politician itself, politician and his environment, as well as other persons / phenomena.

The assumption may relate to the activities of the subject itself (in conjunction with *I*), the joint activities of the subject of the statement and other persons (in conjunction with *we*) and other persons in general (in conjunction with other pronouns and nouns). Most often in the discourse of political speeches, this meaning is characteristic of the modal verb *may*, for example:

*I **may** have been wrong* (BPS: URL); *If we falter in our leadership we **may** endanger the peace of the world and we shall surely endanger the welfare of the nation* (PSA: URL); *Our challenges **may be** new. The instruments with which we meet them may be new. But those values upon which our success depends — hard work and honesty, courage and fair play, tolerance and curiosity, loyalty and patriotism — these things are old* (PSA: URL).

In the first passage, Tony Blair suggests that he was wrong. In the second fragment, Harry Truman expresses the probability of a threat to world peace and to the well-being of the American nation if the country's leadership acts indecisively. In the third passage in his inaugural speech in 2009, Barack Obama suggests that the country will face new challenges, fight them with new methods. But the values on which their success depends such as hard work, honesty, courage, devotion, patriotism, remain unchanged.

Thus, British speeches are characterized by a greater variety of means of expression of supposition (*can, could, may, might*). While American speeches have almost no supposition directed at the politician himself, the subject of the speech. American politicians direct the bulk of their suppositions at other people they are speaking about.

The supposition is a special kind of modal meaning. It shows the subjective assessment of the speaker to the reality of the statement. If a person is not sure of

the truth of the facts, he announces it as something probable or improbable, in other words, he assumes a correspondence to reality (Querler, p. 37):

*He, Doctor Slammer, of the Ninety-seventh, to be extinguished in a moment, by a man whom nobody had ever seen before and whom nobody knew even now! Doctor Slammer – Doctor Slammer of the Ninety-seventh rejected! **Impossible! It could not be!** Yes, it was; there they were. What! Introducing his friend! **Could he believe his eyes!*** (Dickens, p. 44)

In the fragment, the supposition is the most common modal relationship because the subject, Doctor Slammer, is not sufficiently informed about the reasons why the widow has stopped noticing his courtship (so the doctor cannot categorically state or deny this fact).

The main means of expressing modal meaning between the subject of the action and the action itself are modal verbs. This method is lexical and syntactic, since the modal meaning is conveyed by the lexical meaning of the modal verb, which is a syntactic unit (Zandvoort, p. 90). The peculiarity of the lexical meaning of modal verbs consists in the expression of various shades of modality, for example, the possibility/probability:

*“Such”, thought Mr. Pickwick, “are the narrow views of those philosophers who, content with examining the things that lie before them, look not to the truths which are hidden beyond. As well **might** I be content to gaze on Goswell Street forever, without one effort to penetrate to the hidden countries which on every side surround it”* (Dickens, p. 28).

Therefore, modal verbs express not an action, but an attitude to action and perform the function of a modal verb predicate in a sentence.

It is worth noting that the modality of probability is manifested in the texts of scientific articles in the field of information technology, medicine and pharmacy at three main levels (Heine, p. 99): lexical, syntactic and textual.

At the **lexical level**, there is a wide range of means of expressing modality in scientific and technical texts. They include:

1. Modal verbs (must, can/could, may/might, should, ought to).

The modal verb *can* is used to state facts, describe phenomena, processes and their properties:

*The system **can** be controlled by clever computer software or teleoperated by a remote human operator (Calo, p. 6); Implant removal **should** be followed by adequate post-operative management to avoid fracture or refracture of the bone (Khan, p. 243); The surgeon **must** warn patient that the device **cannot** and does not replicate a normal healthy bone, that the device **can** break or become damaged as a result of strenuous activity, trauma, mal-union or non-union and that the device has a finite expected service life and **may** need to be removed at some time in the future (Khan, p. 240); The risk of post-operative complication (e.g. failure of an implant) is higher if patients are obese and/or **cannot** follow the recommendations of the physician because of any mental or neuromuscular disorder (Piro, p. 127).*

Choice and alternative is an important problem of scientific discourse, as the scientist has to choose between different theories, possible solutions or alternatives. The modal verbs *may* and *could* are used to express the choice between two or more alternatives. For example:

*Mobile operators **may** be obliged to restate their accounts to reflect changes in accounting rules or **may** switch items within the accounts (as happens, for example, when a network holding is put up for sale) (Curwen, p. 4); For this reason post-operative instructions and warnings to patients are extremely important. External immobilization (e.g. bracing or casting) **may** be employed until X-rays or other procedures confirm adequate bone consolidation (Piro, p. 346).*

Prediction and forecasting are one of the most typical functions of scientific and technical texts, including medical and pharmaceutical. Depending on the degree of confidence of the author in the implementation of the future event, the following modal verbs *will*, *could*, *might* are used. For example:

*The confluence of these and other complementary advances will **likely** lead to a sustained and exponential growth of new knowledge and economic*

*opportunity for the foreseeable future (Xavier, p. 2); These early technologies are just the start, and we **might** soon **be** witnessing a personal robotics revolution (Calo, p. 3); Further research is needed to examine whether within the intact animal NAC **will** prove as efficient. This is since pharmacokinetics studies have shown that NAC undergoes extensive first pass (Holgate, p. 109); This **might** lead us to the cell origin of this malignant tumor (Holgate, p. 90).*

When formulating conclusions, a scientific text is characterized by the use of the verb *must* in the sense of necessity as an epistemic logical inference arising from certain preconditions. For example:

*Few people have seen an actual robot, so they **must** draw conclusions from the depictions of robots that they have seen (Calo, p. 5); For this reason those patients **must** have additional post-operative follow-up (Khan, p. 24); For this reason, the surgeon **must** counsel each patient individually on correct behavior and activity after the implantation (Khan, p. 40).*

2. Modal words (*perhaps, maybe*).

Modal words are defined as a special lexical and grammatical category (part of speech) that expresses subjective modal meanings i.e. the speaker's point of view on the attitude of speech to reality. The veracity of the presented information can be judged from the use of modal words and their lexical equivalents, which carry the pragmatic meaning of an supposition or doubt (Конопляник, p. 91). In the analysis of scientific, mostly popular science and scientific journalistic texts, the following examples of the use of modal words of probability were found:

*The third and **perhaps** most critical area and often overlooked, is sustainment (Holgate, p. 208); Induced abortion is **maybe** the most contentious issue within reproductive health (Holgate, p. 199); **Perhaps** search engines can also "read" digital text and images that form website content more generally, so in a sense all digital information comes in both a humanreadable and machine-readable form (Lipton, p. 9).*

3. Adverbs (*possibly, probably, obviously, likely*):

A large number of adverbs with the meaning of probability have been found in scientific texts. For example:

*In practical terms, this **probably** means that we should legislate robots that the public will not anthropomorphize strongly ... (Calo, p. 21); **It is likely** that NAC and Zn/DFO (rather than DFO alone) **could** provide a beneficial outcome (Holgate, p. 90).*

4. Constructions with an adjective (*it's doubtful that, it's clear that, it's apparent that, it's obvious that, it is possible that, etc.*). For example:

***It is possible that** a greater number of Internet-related cases are effectively resolved at the jurisdictional stage and that courts do not get a chance to rule on substantive legal issues as often as they do in non-Internet cases involving multiple jurisdictions (Lipton, p. 7); **It is impossible** for individuals to interact online without the assistance of one or more intermediaries (Lipton, p. 10); **It is anticipated that** in both ways the antioxidants **will** get access to the lens through the posterior chamber of the aqueous humor (Holgate, p. 109).*

At the **syntactic level**, modality in English-language scientific texts is expressed mainly by the following means:

1. The Subjunctive Mood (including Conditionals): conditions and criteria for the reality of the supposition, possibility and probability. For example:

We face even larger tasks if we are to craft a legal environment that, on the one hand, correctly balances the needs to encourage experimentation and investment in technology... (Calo, p. 13); If cyberlaw is regarded as the law of the intermediated information exchange, some issues become more peripheral to the field than existing casebooks and syllabi would suggest (Lipton, p. 4); The implant is a short-term implant. In the event of a delay in bone consolidation, or if such consolidation does not take place, or if explantation is not carried out, complications may occur, for example fracture or loosening of the implant or instability of the implant system (Khan, p. 112).

2. Parenthetical phrases: uncertainty, doubt or ambiguity. For example:

*Another aspect of cyberspace regulation that has also taken up significant space in cyberlaw casebooks to date – and **perhaps could** now be relegated to a position of lesser importance – is the question of legislative competence of domestic governments to regulate online conduct (Lipton, p. 7); While cyberlaw courses have become a staple in law school curricula, there is little consensus as to what the subject **might** – or **should** – entail (Lipton, p. 1).*

Textual modality is manifested when the reader is able to form his idea of the thematic field of the literary work or text. A reference should be made to the fact that the modality of the text is an expression in the text of the author's attitude to the reported, his concept, point of view, position, his value orientations, formulated to communicate them to the reader.

Ways of expressing this attitude and evaluation can be different, selective for each author, they are motivated and purposeful. General modality as an expression of the author's attitude to the reported forces to perceive the text not as the sum of individual units, but as a whole (artistic) work.

Thus, the modality of the scientific text is a lexical and grammatical representation of the author's attitude to the knowledge set out in the text. The texts of English-language scientific articles on information technology, medicine and pharmacy are characterized by modality, in particular probability, which is expressed by various means at the lexical, syntactic and textual levels.

Conclusions to Chapter Three

Means of expressing the modality of probability / possibility in dialogical speech are widely represented, firstly, by modal verbs such as *can, may, could, might*, as well as *must, ought to, should, will*, and by modal words *perhaps, possibly, probably, maybe, by (any) chance, evidently, apparently* with the meaning of doubt and supposition. Pragmatic markers of probability in monologue texts (literary, political, scientific, in particular scientific and journalistic in the field of IT technologies, medicine and pharmacy) at the lexical level have been: 1) modal

verbs *can/could, may/might, should, must, will*; 2) modal words *perhaps, maybe*, mainly in popular science texts; 3) adverbs *possibly, probably, likely, obviously* and 4) constructions with adjectives (*it is possible that, it is impossible that*, etc.). At the syntactic level, the modality of probability in scientific, political and artistic texts is expressed mainly by the following means: 1) the Subjunctive Mood, in particular Conditionals, and 2) parenthetical phrases with the meaning of uncertainty, doubt and ambiguity. The textual modality of probability is an expression in the text of the author's attitude to the reported. Modality at the level of the text is manifested when the reader is able to form an idea of the subject of the work (fiction) or text (political or scientific).

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

In linguistics modality is differentiated into objective and subjective. Subjective modality, in contrast to the objective, is an optional feature of statement and is expressed by such means as: word order, intonation, lexical repetitions, modal words and verbs, exclamations, parenthetical words and phrases, parenthetical sentences and word order in a sentence. There are two types of modality with their further division into subtypes: subjective modality: subtype 'the relationship between the subject of the action and the action', subtype 'the attitude of the speaker to the content of the statement'; objective modality: subtype 'the attitude of the content of the utterance to reality' (in terms of 'reality-unreality'). The category of modality is an objective and subjective lexico-grammatical category, one of the component parts of which is probability. As a result of the study of the concept of probability, the following its shades have been highlighted: full confidence; almost complete confidence; assumption: about the possibility of action, which includes uncertainty, doubt about the possibility of action, about the impossibility of action, which includes incredibility of the action.

Linguistic means of expressing probability in the English language comprise a large class, which includes modal verbs, modal words as well as verbs and phrases of mental activity, Moods. They can complement (for example, Moods and modal words) and replace each other (modal verbs, modal words, verbs and phrases of mental activity). Through them, various shades of a given meaning are expressed (supposition, certainty).

The category of linguistic modality expresses the attitude of a message to reality from the point of view of the speaker. Modality covers those grammatical means that have developed due to the purpose of language as a means of communication. Modality is conveyed by all meanings and shades expressed by synthetic and analytical forms of the mood of the verb, i.e. it is a functional-semantic category that expresses different types of relationship between an utterance and reality.

The expression of the assessment of an utterance from the side of the subject is a meaning common to all modal words. Within the general meaning of evaluation, modal words express two particular meanings: rational and emotional assessment. This is the basis for the derivation of two semantic types of modal words with a number of subtypes. Mention should be made of modal words that are involved in the implementation of three types of nomination: simple, complex and through text.

Modality includes those grammatical means that have developed due to the purpose of language as a means of communication, ensuring the availability of the communicated thought. Lexical and grammatical means of expressing modality in the English language make up modal verbs, words and forms of the Mood. The expression of modality in a communication via modal words and the Subjunctive mood is the most specific. The use of modality in a communicative situation is necessary in order to express one's opinion or predict probable / unlikely actions.

The category of modality of possibility/probability, verbalized in English texts, occupies a special place in the process of cognizing the objective world. Accordingly, it is an important part of the invalid reality. This category is reduced to the expression of modal assessment. The author's influence on the recipient through a specific text is provided via the use of linguistic means which explicate the semantic and pragmatic relations in it. Modal means of possibility and probability mark the attitude of the sender of information to the content of the message. This takes into account the possibility of transferring the author's knowledge about the situation of real or unreal reality in his assessment of the possibility/impossibility or probability/improbability of the analyzed one.

Means of expressing the modality of probability / possibility in dialogic speech are widely represented, firstly, by modal verbs such as *can, may, could, might, as well as must, ought to, should, will*, and secondly, by modal words *perhaps, possibly, probably, maybe, by (any) chance, evidently, apparently* with the meaning of doubt and supposition.

Pragmatic markers of probability in monologue texts at the lexical level are: modal verbs *can/could, may/might, should, must, will*; modal words *perhaps, maybe*, mainly in popular science texts; adverbs *possibly, probably, likely, obviously, seemingly, supposingly* and constructions with adjectives (*it is possible that, it is impossible that, It seems*, etc.). At the syntactic level, the modality of probability in the texts is expressed mainly by the following means: the Subjunctive Mood and parenthetical phrases with the meaning of uncertainty and doubt. The textual modality of probability is an expression of the author's attitude to the reported information in the text. Modality at the level of the text is manifested when the reader is able to form an idea of the subject of the work or text.

Linguistic means, in the semantics of which there is a seme 'possibility / impossibility', represented by modal verbs *can/could, may/might, must, ought to, will, should*, create and enhance the effect of influence. The "possibility / impossibility/probability" modality in the scientific, publicistic and literary texts is represented by lexical and grammatical means, in particular, persuasive vocabulary, modal verbs in the inference function, and constructions with hypothetical meaning.

The peculiarities of the use of English adverbs *apparently, evidently, seemingly, obviously, probably, possibly, perhaps*, as well as the constructions *it seems, it is (im)possible*, which function as markers of epistemic evaluation have been also analyzed. These lexical means express varying degrees of the speaker's certainty in the veracity of the information being conveyed. If one places them on the veracity scale, then *obviously* and *evidently* will be the closest to the pole of full certainty, *apparently* will indicate a high, but not full degree of certainty, but *seemingly* and *it seems* to be indicators of the speaker's incomplete certainty in the veracity of what is being reported.

Another feature of the use of this group of linguistic means of probability is that they are used by narrators to describe the emotional state or thoughts of other people. Statements that relate to the mental or emotional realm of others are always

probabilistic, even in cases where emotions or thoughts appear externally, for example, in facial expressions or certain actions. The initially probabilistic nature of judging the state of another person can be considered one of the reasons for the semantic shift from adverbial to discursive use.

RESUME

Магістерську роботу присвячено дослідженню маркерів ймовірності в сучасній англійській мові, зокрема номінативні та прагматичні аспекти.

Актуальність роботи визначається загальною спрямованістю сучасних лінгвістичних досліджень на виявлення маркерів ймовірності в сучасній англійській мові, зокрема номінативні та прагматичні аспекти.

Об'єктом дослідження є категорія модальності в англійській мові.

Предметом дослідження є маркери ймовірності в сучасній англійській мові, зокрема номінативні та прагматичні аспекти.

Матеріалом дослідження послужили художні, публіцистичні та наукові тексти, відібрані з творів художньої літератури британських та американських письменників, політичні промови, газетні та наукові статті.

У **вступі** обґрунтовано актуальність теми роботи, визначено об'єкт і предмет дослідження, сформульовано його мету та завдання, схарактеризовано джерела добору ілюстративного матеріалу та дослідницькі методи, наукову новизну, розкрито практичну цінність дослідження.

У **першому розділі** визначено теоретичні засади вивчення модальності та модальних слів у лінгвістиці; охарактеризовано лінгвістичну модальність та засоби її вираження; досліджено питання прислівників ймовірності в англомовних розвідках.

У **другому розділі** розглянуто номінативний аспект модальних слів у сучасній англійській мові; проаналізовано модальні слова як одиниці номінації; виокремлено семантичні типи модальних слів.

У **третьому розділі** визначено комунікативні та прагматичні характеристики модальних слів; проаналізовано модальні маркери ймовірності як засоби вираження модальності в діалогічному мовленні; охарактеризовано прагматичні маркери ймовірності у монологічних текстах.

У **висновках** коротко викладено основні результати дослідження.

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Carter R., McCarthy M. *Exploring Spoken English*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1997. 459 p.
- Chafe W.L. *Evidentiality in English Conversation and Academic Writing* / W.L. Chafe // *Evidentiality: The Linguistic Coding of Epistemology* / Ed. by W.L. Chafe & J. Nichols. – Norwood, NJ: Ablex Publishing Corporation, 2009. – P. 261-274.
- Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language* / [R. Quirk, S. Greenbaum, G. Leech, and J. Svartvik.] – London: Longman, 2010. – 1796 p.
- Dijk T. A. van. *Society and Discourse: How Social Contexts Influence Text and Talk* / Teun A. van Dijk. – Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2009. – 287 p.
- Dirven R. *Cognitive Exploration of Language and Linguistics* / R. Dirven, M. Verspoor. – Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins Publishing Company, 2011. – 300 p.
- Diver W. *The Modal System of the English Verb* // *Word*. 1964. – v.20. – № 3. – p. 322-352.
- Downing A. *English Grammar: A University Course* / A. Downing, P. Locke. – 2nd edit. – London; New York: Routledge, 2006. – 610 p.
- Fintel von Kai. *Modality and Language*. *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* (Second Edition). MacMillan reference, USA, 2006. 128 p.
- Fleischman S. *The Future in Thought and Language: Diachronic Evidence from Romance* / S. Fleischman. – Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2012. – 218 p.
- Gordon E. M. *A Grammar of Present-day English* / E.M. Gordon, I.P. Krylova. – Moscow: Higher School Publishing House, 2009. – 333 p.
- Heine B. *Cognitive Foundations of Grammar* / B. Heine. – New York: Oxford University Press, 2009. – 185 p.

- Halliwell J.O. Popular Rhymes and Nursery Tales: A sequel to the Nursery Rhymes of England. London: J.R. Smith, 4, Old Compton Street, Soho Square, 2009. – 277 p.
- Hermeren L. On Modality in English. A study of the semantics of the modals. Stockholm: Printab Lund, 2012. – 195 p.
- Hyland K. Hedging in academic writing and EAP textbooks: English for Specific Purposes. 1994. Vol. 13. P. 239–256.
- Hyland K. Hedging in scientific research articles / K. Hyland. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1998. 128 p.
- Keynes J. M. A Treatise on Probability. New York: Evanston, 2017. – 466 p.
- Kratzer A. Modality / A. Kratzer. Semantics: An International Handbook of Contemporary Research / eds A. von Stechow and D. Wunderlich. – B.: Walter de Gruyter, 1991. – P. 639–650.
- Kroeger P. R. Analyzing Grammar. An Introduction / P.R. Kroeger. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2005. – 383 p.
- Lakoff R. Language in context. *Language*. 1972. № 48. P. 9–19.
- Langacker R. Cognitive Grammar: A Basic Introduction / R. Langacker. – Oxford University Press, USA, 2008. – 584 p.
- Le Querler N. Typologie des modalités, Caen: Presses universitaires de Caen, 1996. 219 p.
- Leech G. A Communicative Grammar of English / G. Leech, J. Svartvik. – London: Longman, 2009. – 324 p.
- Leech G. Semantics. New York: Penguin Books, 2009. 235 p.
- Leech G. The Pragmatics of Politeness. New York: Oxford University Press, 2014. 134 p.
- Lyons J. Semantics / J. Lyons. Cambridge University Press, 1999. 328 p.
- Morozova I. B. Subjective Modality of the Utterance in the Process of Speech Communication / I. B. Morozova // Морозова И.Б., Чайковская И.Ф. The Use of Modal Verbs: учебное пособие для студентов пед. институтов и

университетов по спец. 2103 – “Иностранный язык”; 10.02.04 – “Германские языки”. – Одесса, 2010. – С. 6–8.

Murphy R. English Grammar in Use. A Self-Study Reference and Practice Book for Intermediate Students / Raymond Murphy. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994. – 342 p.

Oxford Advanced Learner’s Dictionary. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011. – 1780 p.

Palmer F. Modality in English: theoretical, descriptive and typological issues / F. Palmer // Modality in contemporary English; R. Facchinetti, M. Krug, and F. Palmer (eds.). – Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 2003. – P. 1–17.

Palmer F. R. Modality and the English Modals / Frank Robert Palmer. – N.Y.: Longman, 1990. – 256 p.

Palmer F. R. Mood and Modality / Frank Robert Palmer. – 2nd ed. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. – 236 p.

Perkins M. R. Modal expressions in English. London: Pinter, 2010. 217 p.

Swan M. Practical English Usage / M. Swan. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. – 654 p.

Thompson A. S. A Practical English Grammar / A. S. Thompson, A. V. Martinet. – Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1986. – 384 p.

Wright G. H. von. Deontic modality / G.H. von Wright. Mind: A Quarterly Review. – Vol. LX. – No. 237. – P. 1–15.

Zandvoort R. W. A Handbook of English Grammar. L.: Longmans, 2015. – 349 p.

Адмони В.Г. Основы теории грамматики. – М.; Л., 1999. – 105 с.

Ахманова О. С. Словарь лингвистических терминов / О.С. Ахманова. – М.: Сов. энциклопедия, 2012. – 608 с.

Балли Ш. Общая лингвистика и вопросы французского языка. – М.: Изд-во иностр. лит., 2015. – 416 с.

Безноса А. Мовні індикатори вираження модальності ввічливості. *Наукові записки [Кіровоградського державного педагогічного університету імені*

- Володимира Винниченка*]: зб. наук. пр. Кіровоград. Сер., Філологічні науки 2009. № 81 (3). С. 206-210.
- Блох М. Я. Теоретические основы грамматики / М.Я. Блох. – 3-е изд., испр. – М.: Высшая школа, 2002. – 160 с.
- Будагов Р. А. Введение в науку о языке. Москва: Добросвет-2000, 2003. — 544 с.
- Бурлакова В. В. Теоретическая грамматика английского языка / В.В. Бурлакова. – Л.: Изд-во Ленинградского университета, 2013. – 255 с.
- Ваулина С. С. Эволюция средств выражения модальности возможности в русском языке (XI–XVII вв.): дис. ... д-ра филол. наук. Л., 1991. 265 с.
- Виноградов В. В. Грамматическое учение о слове. – М.: МП РСФСР, 2009. – 784 с.
- Войналович Л. П. Модальність як багатоаспектна лінгвістична категорія. *Наукові записки [Ніжинського державного університету ім. Миколи Гоголя]*: зб. наук. пр. Ніжин. Філологічні науки. 2013. Кн. 3. С. 28-32.
- Гатина Р. Г. Модальность возможности и невозможности и средства ее выражения на материале башкирского языка: дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Уфа, 2007. – 235 с.
- Горбунова Е. В. Лексико-грамматические средства выражения вероятности в английском языке дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.04: М., 2003. 150 с.
- Грепл М. О сущности модальности, языкознание в Чехословакии. М., 2016. 234 с.
- Грижак Л. Специфіка мовного вираження модальних значень в американському політичному дискурсі. *Науковий вісник Чернівецького університету*: зб. наук. пр. Чернівці. Германська філологія. 2012. № 630 – 631. С. 142-150.
- Давиденко Л. Г. Коммуникативная модальность предложений с глаголами can/could, may/might в современном английском языке: автореф. дис. ... канд. филол. наук. Одесса, 1984. 23 с.

- Ермолаева Л. С. Очерки по сопоставительной грамматике германских языков. URL: <https://www.booksite.ru/fulltext/ermolaeva/index.htm>
- Зверева Е. А. Научная речь и модальность (система английского глагола) / Е. А. Зверева. – Л. : Наука, 2014. – 158 с.
- Золотова Г.А. Коммуникативная грамматика русского языка / Г.А.Золотова, Н.К.Онипенко, М.Ю.Сидорова; РАН Институт русского языка имени В.В.Виноградова, Московский государственный университет имени М.В. Ломоносова. Филологический факультет. – М., 2010. – 528 с.
- Касевич В. Б. Семантика. Синтаксис. Морфология / В.Б. Касевич. – М.: Наука, 2010. – 311 с.
- Каушанская В. Л. Грамматика английского языка / В.Л. Каушанская. М.: Страт, 2009. 320 с.
- Кобрина Н. А., Корнеева Е. А. и др. Грамматика английского языка. Морфология. Синтаксис. 2-е изд. — СПб.: Союз, 1999. — 496 с.
- Колшанский Г. В. Объективная картина мира в познании и языке. М.: Наука, 2013. — 108 с.
- Конопляник Е. А. Особенности прагматики модальных слов / Е.А. Конопляник // *Актуальные проблемы германистики, романистики и русистики: сборник материалов ежегодной Международной научной конференции*, Екатеринбург, 4-5 февраля 2011. – Екатеринбург: Уральский гос. ун-т, 2011. – С. 90 – 93.
- Корунець І. В. Порівняльна типологія англійської та української мов / І.В. Корунець. Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2006. – 464 с.
- Коцюба Н. Й. Лексико-граматичні засоби вираження категорії модальності в офіційно-діловому тексті. *Наукові праці [Чорноморського державного університету імені Петра Могили комплексу «Києво-Могилянська академія»]*: наук. журн. Миколаїв. Серія, Філологія. Мовознавство 2014. № 221. (209). С. 42-45.

- Кошева А. Ш. Функционально-семантическое поле модальности в разносистемных языках: автореф. дис. на соискание учен. степени канд. филол. наук. Специальность – 10.02.19. Нальчик, 2006. 28 с.
- Мильруд Р. П. Типологические характеристики модальности в научно-исследовательском письменном тексте / Р.П. Мильруд, И.В. Антипов // Язык и культура. — № 1 (5). — Т.: Том. гос. ун-т, 2009. — С. 29–38.
- Плунгян В. А. Введение в грамматическую семантику: грамматические значения и грамматические системы языков мира: учебное пособие / В.А. Плунгян. – М.: Рос. гос. гум. ун.-т, 2011. – 669 с.
- Почепцов Г. Г. Прагматические аспекты изучения предложения и текста / Г.Г. Почепцов. – К.: КГПИИЯ, 2009. – 212 с.
- Ралдугіна К. О. Модальність як логіко-філософська та лінгвістична категорія: URL: https://web.znu.edu.ua/herald/issues/2008/fil_2008_1_2/2008-26-06/029.pdf
- Романова О. В. Модальные слова в современном английском языке: дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.04 Ростов н/Д, 1997. 182 с.
- Саидова З. Э. Структура функционально-семантического поля модальности возможности/невозможности в английском языке. 2016. ч. 4. № 12 (66). С. 160-163.
- Саркисян М. Р. Содержательная характеристика средств выражения модального значения «возможность/невозможность» в современном английском языке (на материале аналитических статей) / М.Р. Саркисян // Известия ВГПУ. 2017. С. 120-124.
- Сухомлина Т. А. Модальные способы выражения будущего времени в художественном монологическом тексте. Вопросы когнитивной лингвистики. 2015. № 1 (042). С. 85-88.
- Теория функциональной грамматики. Темпоральность. Модальность / Бондарко А.В., Беляева Е.И., Бирюлин Л.А. и др.; Ред. кол.: Бондарко А.В.(отв. ред.) и др.; АН СССР. Ин-т языкознания. – Л.: Наука, 1990. – 263 с.
- Ткачук В. М. Категорія суб'єктивної модальності: Монографія. – Тернопіль: Підручники й посібники, 2003. – 240 с.

- Хоменко Е. Г. Граматика англійської мови. К.: Знання-Прес, 2007. 606 с.
- Цивьян Т. В. Хлебниковская лингвистика: предварительные заметки: URL: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0304347904800607>
- Черноватий Л. М. Практична граматика англійської мови з вправами / Л.М. Черноватий, В.І. Карабан. Вінниця: Нова Книга, 2006. 284 с.
- Шахматов А. А. Синтаксис / А.А. Шахматов. – Л.: Учпедгиз, 2014. – 484 с
- Шведова Н. Ю. Грамматика / Н.Ю. Шведова. – М.: Наука, 2008. – 709 с.
- Шило С. Поняттєві сфери термінів для номінації спонукальної модальності. *Актуальні питання гуманітарних наук: міжвуз. зб. наук. пр. молодих вчен. Дрогоб. держ. пед. ун-ту ім. Івана Франка. Дрогобич Мистецтвознавство. 2017. № 17. С. 161-166.*
- Шинкарук В.Д. Категорії модусу і диктуму в структурі речення: Монографія. – Чернівці: Рута, 2011. – 272 с.
- Шнуровська Л. В. Теоретичні засади вивчення категорії модальності в сучасній лінгвістиці. *Вісник Київського національного лінгвістичного університету. Київ. Серія, Філологія. 2016. Т. 19. № 2. С. 140-148.*
- Шнуровська Л. В. Інтонація модальності в англійському мовленні. *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова: зб. наук. пр. Київ. Серія 9, Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов. 2017. № 15. С. 234-241.*
- Шнуровська Л. В. Лінгвоментальна площина модальності. *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова: зб. наук. пр. Київ. Серія 9, Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов. 2015. № 12. С. 252-260.*
- Штелинг Д. А. Грамматическая семантика английского языка. Фактор человека в языке: учебное пособие. – М.: МГИМО ЧеРо, 2014. – 254 с.
- Языкознание: большой энциклопедический словарь / глав. ред. В.Н. Ярцева. – 2-е изд. – М., 2000. – 668 с.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATION MATERIALS

- Boyd D. *The Alchemist*. M.: Ballantine Books, 2003. 240 p.
- Bradbury R. *Something Wicked this Way Comes*. London: Bantam books, 1990. 178 p.
- Buncombe A. Donald Trump tweets photo of Democrat Chuck Schumer with Vladimir Putin in swipe at Russia investigation. *The Independent*. URL: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/donald-trump-russia-putin-photo-chuck-schumer-tweet-latest-a7610426.html>
- Calo R. *Robot Law*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2016.
- Christie A. *Why Didn't They Ask Evans?* M.: Vysshaya Shkola, 1991. 175 p.
- Curwen P., Whalley J. *Mobile Telecommunications Networks: Restructuring as a Response to a Challenging Environment*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2014.
- Dickens Ch. *The Pickwick Papers*. Penguin Popular Classics, 2009. 896 p.
- England Ch. Unexpected deaths of six Russian diplomats in four months triggers conspiracy theories. *The Independent*. URL: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/europe/russia-diplomats-deaths-theories-putin-kremlin-a7602201.html>
- Durrell G. *My Family and Other Animals*. M.: Vysshaya Shkola, 2007. 174 p.
- Fitzgerald F. S. *The Ice Palace*. M.: Progress Publishers, 1999. P. 74–75.
- Fowles J. *The Collector*. N. Y.: Dell, 1999. 125 p.
- Galsworthy J. *Selected works*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2012. 237 p.
- Greene G.W. *The Third Man*. London, 1999. 265 p.
- Hicks D. *Meet the Parkers*. Stockholm: The British Broadcasting Corporation, 2018. P. 73–89.
- Holgate S., Broide D. *Allergy*. New York: Houghton Mifflin, 2012. – 403 p.
- Khan Sh., Meier B. Pakistan fears India's tallest ever flag could be used for 'spying'. *The Independent*. URL:

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/india-tallest-flag-pakistan-spying-fears-lahore-a7613956.html>

Khan M. G. Encyclopedia of Heart Diseases. London: Bantam books, 2006. 675 p.

Kirillova E. P. Talks on Familiar Topics. M.: Mezhdunar. otnosheniya, 1996. 187 p.

Klug F. Kim Jong-nam's assassination: Four questions surrounding the death of North Korean leader's half-brother. The Independent. URL:

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/asia/kim-jong-nam-assasination-latest-malaysia-questions-north-korea-leader-un-il-half-brother-poisoning-a>

Lawhead F. W. The Voyage of Discovery. A Historical introduction to philosophy. Cengage Advantage Books, 2017. 600 p. URL:

<https://books.google.com.ua/books?id=1z7AAgAAQBAJ&pg=PA258&lpg=PA258&dq=can%E2%80%99t+have+much+significance&source=bl>

Lawrence D. H. England, My England. M.: Менеджер, 1997. С. 175–188.

Lipton J. Rethinking Cyberlaw: A New Vision for Internet Law. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2015.

Milne A. House at Pooh Corner. M.: Gardners Books, 2011. P. 54–67.

Murdoch I. The Sandcastle. M.: Progress Publishers, 2012. 235 p.

Orwell G. 1984. N. Y.: The New American Library Inc., 2009. 393 p.

Olleros Xavier F. Research Handbook on Digital Transformations. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing, 2016.

Osborne S. Donald Trump's wiretap claim could be a matter that brings down a president, former CIA analyst says. The Independent. URL:

<https://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/us-politics/donald-trump-barack-obama-wiretap-claim-could-bring-down-president-former-cia->

Peck T. Brexit: Ending free movement will not reduce immigration, peers warn.

The Independent: URL: <https://www.independent.co.uk/news/uk/politics/brexit-latest-eu-free-movement-not-reduce-immigration-house-of-lords-eu-home-affairs-su>

Piro Di J. T. Encyclopedia of Clinical Pharmacy. Harper Colins Publishers, 2003. 958 p.

Shaw B. The complete plays of Bernard Shaw. L., Hamlyn, 2009. 650 p.

Sheldon S. Nothing Lasts Forever. M.: Harper Colins Publishers, 1995. 127 p.

Vold E. Th. Epistemic Modality Markers in Research Articles / E. Vold // Applied Linguistics. Vol. 16, № 1. 2006. – P. 90 – 109.

BPS: British Political Speech: URL: <http://www.-britishpoliticalspeech.org/speech- archive.htm>

PSA: Presidential Speech Archive: URL: <http://millercenter.org/president/speeches>

RBPO: Remarks by President Obama to the United Nations General Assembly. — United Nations Headquarters. — New York: URL: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2015/09/28/remarks-president-obama-united-nations-general-assembly>

SRT: Special report: terrorism in the US: the full text of George Bush's address to a joint session of Congress and the American people: URL: <https://www.theguardian.com/world/2001/sep/21/september11.usa13>