Міністерство освіти і науки України

Київський національний лінгвістичний університет

Кафедра германської і фіно-угорської філології

Курсова робота

Засоби вираження модальності в сучасній англійській мові

Студентки групи МЛа 07-19
факультету германської філології
та перекладу
денної форми навчання
спеціальності 035 філологія
спеціалізація Германські мови
та літератури (переклад включно)
перша – англійська
Голуб Валерії Євгенії

Науковий керівник:
кандидат філологічних наук,
професор
Волкова Лідія Михайлівна

Національна шкала _____
Кількість балів   _____
Оцінка ЄКТС   _____

Київ 2023

Ministry of Education and Science of Ukraine

Kyiv National Linguistic University

Chair of Germanic and Finno-Ugrian Philology

Term Paper

MEANS OF EXPRESSING MODALITY IN MODERN ENGLISH

VALERIIA HOLUB

MLa 07-19

Germanic Philology and Translation Department

Research Adviser

Prof. L. M. Volkova

PhD (Linguistics)

Kyiv 2023

CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION

The Term Paper is focused on the means of expressing modality in Modern English.

Modality in linguistics is one of linguistic universals, it can find expression at various levels of language (morphological, syntactic, intonation). The semantic category of modality conveys the speaker's relationship to the content of his statement, the target instruction, the relationship of the content of the statement to reality. Modality can have the meaning of assertion, command, wish, assumption, authenticity, reality or unreality.

A significant contribution to the study of the modality category was made by such scientists as: Cappelle, B., De Sutter G., Depraetere, I., Facchinetti, R., Krug, M., Palmer, F., Kai von. Fintel, Griffiths, P., Huddleston, R., Pullum, G. K., Swan M., Walter C., Hoye, L., Huddleston, R., Kratzer, A., Leech, G., Svartvik, J., and others.

Thanks to the numerous works of scientists, the main concepts related to the functional status of the specified category were defined, and the main means of its expression in the language were also described. However, the "phenomenon of modality" only increases the interest of scientists in its study.

Modern linguists use a variety of approaches that allow to study the language comprehensively, taking into account functional-semantic, pragmatic, system-structural, cognitive and communicative aspects.

My course paper is **relevant** due to the fact that many scientists have been dealing with the question "what is modality" for a long time, and even today modality is considered an interesting linguistic topic. There is no quite clear definition and classification in English language.

The **aim** of the research is to determine the means and the features of expressing modality in Modern English.

The research objectives are the following **tasks**:

1. To study theoretical foundations of modality in English.

2. To identify sentence as a communicative unit.

3. To study main peculiarities of sentence modality, identify its types.

4. To analyze means of expressing modality in Modern English language.

5. To analyze semantic, pragmatic and lexico-grammatical features of modality.

The object of my Course Paper is means of expressing modality.

The subject of the research is morphological and syntactic peculiarities of modality in Modern English.

The **theoretical significance** of my work can be explained by the fact my research collects and analyzes information about modality in English language, which makes a certain contribution to solving topical issues in the theory and grammar of modern English.

The **structure** of the term paper. The term paper consists of an introduction, two chapters (with subsections), general conclusions, a summary and a list of the literature used.

CHAPTER ONE. THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF MODALITY IN ENGLISH

1.1. Sentence as a communicative unit

Communication is an exchange of sentences. A sentence is a unit of speech the grammatical structure of which conforms to the laws of the language and which serves as the chief means of conveying a thought. A sentence contains a subject and a predicate, followed, if necessary, by other words which make up the meaning (Leech & Svartvik, 2002).

Sentences can be classified (Leech & Svartvik, 2002) on the following grounds:

I.   according to the purpose of utterance;

II.   according to the syntactic structure.

According to the purpose of utterance sentences are subdivided (Leech & Svartvik, 2002) into:

1. declarative (statements);

2. interrogative (questions);

3. imperative (commands);

4. exclamatory (exclamations).

The communicative process is a complex and multifaceted concept. The main purpose of this process is to transmit and receive information. The orator (speaker) must convey through the language the information that either belongs to him or received from other sources, and which was not previously recorded, spoken or written (Leech & Svartvik, 2002).

The main characteristics of a sentence as a universal linguistic unit are (Leech & Svartvik, 2002):

1) a sentence is the main linguistic unit;

2) a sentence is the main syntactic unit;

3) a sentence is the main integral part of speech, and accordingly is the main *communicative unit*.

The following features that play a key role in characterizing a sentence as a communicative unit are: *intonation contour, predication, modality, relative semantic completeness* (Griffiths, 2006).

For clarity of understanding of what we are dealing with, we propose to define the following terms (Griffiths, 2006):

- *Communicativeness* is the orientation of speech to the listener, which is expressed by intonation (raising and lowering the tone, intonation selection of individual words, etc.), interjections, reinforcing particles, appeals, etc.

- ***Modality*** is the speaker's personal attitude to his own statement, which is expressed by intonation (intonation can be affirmative or negative, serious or ironic, etc.); parenthesis; particles; form of the verb (actual, conditional or imperative).

- *Predicativeness* is the binding of a statement to reality, which is expressed by means of time forms of the verb (past, long-past, present or future tense) and the circumstances of place and time (spatial and temporal relation).

The communicative function serves to focus attention on information. There are various constructions that perform the referential function used in speech. Every language has such constructions. The referential function is used to focus the attention of the receiver to help him understand the information correctly, according to the intent and purpose of the transmitter. The words that carry out the referential function only focus attention on a specific aspect (Griffiths, 2006).

1.2. Sentence modality, its types

Modality (from the lat. *modalis*) is a functional-semantic category that expresses the relationship of the content of the statement to reality and the speaker to the content of the statement. Modality is a significant feature of a sentence. It can be expressed by intonation, morphological, lexical-grammatical and other means (Depraetere, 2008).

In linguistics, the semantic category of modality conveys the speaker's relationship to the content of his statement, the target instruction, the relationship of the content of the statement to reality. Modality can have the meaning of affirmation, command, wish, assumption, authenticity, reality or unreality (Depraetere, 2008).

It is essential to note that the notion of modality is used in various sciences, particularly in logic and linguistics, which creates some confusion regarding logical and linguistic modalities. In modal logic modality is defined as the relation of the proposition to objective reality on the basis of either its mode of existence (possibility, factuality, necessity), or whether it is true or false (Kai von Fintel, 2006).

The notion of modality in linguistics seems vague and opens a number of possible definitions. Thus, linguistic modality is defined as a functional-semantic (notional) category, which expresses the relation of the utterance to reality-unreality as stated by the speaker (Kai von Fintel, 2006).

The speaker-oriented character of modality in linguistics makes it different from modality in logic. For example: in logic the sentence "*Washington D.C. is the capital of the United States*" is characterized by non-factual (unreal) modality as the proposition is false. In linguistics the same sentence, from the point of view of the speaker, presents the situation as a fact, hence, the type of modality is that of reality (Kai von Fintel, 2006).

It is important to emphasize that linguistics is not concerned with the truth or falseness of utterances, which can be proved only empirically, i.e. experimentally, and have no system of linguistic means to express them. I would like to stress once

again that linguistic modality is concerned with reality-unreality as conceived by the speaker (Kai von Fintel, 2006).

According to this interpretation, fiction (novels, stories, science fiction, etc.) refers to linguistic reality, though the characters of these works may have never existed in real life (Palmer, 2003).

Modality in English grammar can express to express the following semantic aspects: duty and necessity; prohibition; lack of obligation or necessity; permission; ability; advice and hint; offers and invitations; opportunity, expectation and certainty; imagination or fantasy; readiness (Hoye, 1997).

In English, modality in a sentence can be expressed not only by means of a *modal verb* or a *modal expression*.

The issue of speaker-relatedness in modality has traditionally been discussed in terms of the distinction between *subjective* and *objective modality*.

Subjective modality expresses the speaker's attitude to the content of the utterance from the point of view of his awareness of what the sentence is about (Palmer, 2003).

Objective modality is expressed in the meanings of reality or correspondence of the statement of reality and unreality, where the content of the statement reflects a potentially real, objectively possible or desirable situation. The main means of expressing the real objective modality are the tense forms of verbs in the real mood (Portner, 2009).

Nevertheless, the two statements collide in the following findings (Portner, 2009):

–   Any modality is a kind of subjective, since the modalization is necessarily caused by the referent who expresses his attitude.

–   Subjective modality is also called "propositional modality" in some grammars.

–   Modality that is based on the sentence-subject relation is not called subjective, but objective.

–   Objective modality is also called "dymanic modality".

The term *modality* has been used to cover a wide range of elements, including adjectives like *probable*, nouns like *probability*, adverbs like *probably* and verbs like *will*, but for the purpose of this study we will concentrate on the modal verbs and auxiliaries. This category is clearly delineated in English on the basis of four morphosyntactic parameters – modal auxiliaries (Huddleston, 2002):

1) they do not require do-support in interrogative, negative, 'code', and emphatic contexts;

2) do not have an **-s** form for the third person singular;

3) do not have any non-finite (infinitive or imperative) forms;

4) cannot co-occur with each other.

As mentioned above, subjective modality is not a mandatory sign of the message, and therefore it is also called secondary modality, as it forms the second modal layer in the sentence. When comparing the semantic components of the objective and subjective modality, the scope of the second modality turned out to be much wider than the semantic scope of the objective modality (Huddleston, 2002).

Conclusions to Chapter I

We solved the following tasks in Chapter I:

1. To study theoretical foundations of modality in English.

2. To identify sentence as a communicative unit.

3. To study main peculiarities of sentence modality, identify its types.

In view of the above, we also established that modality as a linguistic category is characterized by a close connection with the discursive position of the speaking subject, which determines the level of subjective coloring of each of the modal components.

We also conclude that the speaker-relatedness in modality has traditionally been discussed in terms of the distinction between *subjective* and *objective modality.*

Modality is expressed by formal means (modes of verbs). In grammar studies, modality is interpreted as a sentence category that expresses the relationship of its content to reality from the speaker's point of view and includes such aspects of expression as emotionality, communicative purposefulness, negation, evaluation and time category.

CHAPTER TWO. FUNCTIONAL PECULIARITIES OF MODALITY. MEANS OF ITS EXPRESSION IN MODERN ENGLISH

II.1. Means of expressing modality in Modern English language

So, what is modality? According to Palmer, "*modality is a kind of mood that the modal helps to create together with the main verb in order to change the communicative function.*" To be linguistically precise, modality covers the functions of modal verbs, and can be defined as the "*manner in which the meaning of a clause is qualified so as to reflect the speaker's judgement of the likelihood of the proposition it expresses*." (Palmer 2001)

In addition, Palmer further explains term of "modality" as a "*semantic term related to the meanings that are usually associated with mood; the relation between mood and modality like that between tense and time*." Moreover, various meanings of modal verbs can be further categorized, which, however, causes disputes among linguists. Some of them divide modality into two categories, the others into three main categories, according to the tense and aspect of the modal. (Palmer 2001)

According to Huddleston, "*the distinction between mood and modality is like that between aspect and aspectuality: mood is a category of grammar, modality a category of meaning. Mood is the grammaticalisation of modality within the verbal system. The term 'mood' is most usually applied to inflectional systems of the verb, as in the contrast between indicative, subjunctive, and imperative in such languages as Latin, French, and German*." (Huddleston, 2002).

The study of modals is directly linked with modality and vice versa. According to Huddleston (2002), modals differ according to communicative functions:

– *Epistemic modality*, concerned with the theoretical possibility of propositions being true or not true (including likelihood and certainty);

– *Deonic modality*, concerned with the possibility and necessity in terms of freedom to act (including permission and duty);

– *Dynamic modality*, which may be distinguished from deonic modality, in that with dynamic modality, the conditioning factors are internal – the subject's own ability or willingness to act. (Huddleston, 2002)

The main and most convenient means of expressing modality in the English language are modal verbs and expressions. We will look at them in more detail in this section.

Modal verbs in the English language are a separate class of auxiliary verbs, which are used mainly to express modality (such properties as *opportunity, obligation*, etc.). They can be distinguished from other verbs by their defectiveness (they do not have participle or infinitive forms) and by the fact that they do not take the ending *-(e)s* in the third person singular (Kratzer, 2012).

The main English modal verbs are *can, could, may, might, must, shall, should, will* and *would*. Some other verbs are sometimes, but not always, classified as modal; these include *ought, had better* and (in certain cases) *dare* and *need*. Verbs that share only some of the characteristics of the main modal verbs are sometimes called "semi-modals" or "pseudo-modals" (Palmer, 2003). Examples of using:

1. *In the mean time I can give you some idea of the shape*. (Poe, 1843)

2. *I must confess*: *new to me: never saw anything like it before – unless it was a scull, or a death's head – which is more nearly resembles than anything else that has come under my observation*. (Poe, 1843)

3. *I may say that it is a very excellent skull, according to the vulgar notions about such specimens of physiology – and your scarabaeus must be the queerest scarabaeus in the world if it resembles it*. (Poe, 1843)

4. *What could he be dreaming of?* (Poe, 1843)

5. *You shall go to bed, and I will remain with you a few days, until you get over this*. (Poe, 1843)

6. *I could scarcely refrain from tears*. (Poe, 1843)

7. *I should have rejoiced at any interruption which might have enabled me to get the wanderer home*. (Poe, 1843)

8. *I <u>shall</u> not pretend to describe the feelings with which I gazed*. (Poe, 1843)

9. *It was difficult to say what <u>should</u> be done*. (Poe, 1843)

10. *How <u>dare</u> you to talk with him?* (Poe, 1843)

11. *We need some rest, or we would be entirely exhausted.* (Poe, 1843)

The main support verbs are *be, do* and *have*. All these verbs can function either as main verbs or as auxiliary verbs. As the main verb, do has a complete set of forms (*do, does, did, done, doing*). *Do* in sentences can very often be replaced by a verb with a more precise meaning (Palmer, 2003).

The following verbs mostly have common characteristics with the above, but with certain differences. Sometimes, but not always, they are classified as modal verbs, but they can also be called "semi-modal" (Facchinetti & Krug, 2003):

– The verb *ought* differs in that it is used more often with the infinitive of the form *to-infinitiv*, and not with the usual form of the infinitive;

– The verbs *dare* and *need* can be used as modals and in a negative sense (*Dare he fight?; You dare not do that.; You need not go* (GreenForest Journal, 2016)), although they are more often found in constructions where they act as ordinary inflected verbs. (*He dares to fight; You don't need to go* (GreenForest Journal, 2016)).

– The verb *had* in the expression had better is used as a modal verb, so *had better* (considered as a complex verb) is sometimes classified as modal or semi-modal.

– The verb *used* in the expression *used to* (*do something*) can act as a modal, but is more often used with the auxiliary *do* than with the auxiliary verb syntax: *Did she used to do it?* (or *She didn't use to do it*) and *She didn't used to do it* are more common constructions than *Used she to do it?* and *She used not (usedn't) to do it*.

Other English auxiliary verbs appear in various forms and are not considered modal verbs (Facchinetti & Krug, 2003). Among them are the following:

- *be* – is used as an auxiliary verb in the passive state and constructions of the continuous type, as well as auxiliary constructions, such as *be going to, is to and be about to*;

- *have* – is used as an auxiliary verb in constructions of the perfect type, including in the idiom *have got* (*to*); it is also used in *have to*, which has a modal meaning;

- *do*. (Facchinetti & Krug, 2003)

English does not use more than one modal verb in a row because modal verbs are usually followed by an ordinary verb. They can be combined only with non-modal (or semi-modal) constructions that have a modal function, for example have to - a construction that, despite its function, is not a modal verb. To put double modal forms in the past tense, only the first modal form changes (Facchinetti & Krug, 2003).

With respect to form linguistic modality is expressed by a highly developed system of different means (Kratzer, 2012), such as:

- Morphological categories of mood (e.g. *It is spring. I wish I were you. Stop it!*, of tense and phase; e.g. *If I lived in London I would speak English every day. If he had known about the party, he would have come*.) (GreenForest Journal, 2016)

- Lexical-syntactic means – combinations of modal verbs (*may/might, can/could, must, should, will/would, ought to, etc*.) with the infinitive (e.g. *Don't wait up for me because I might be late. If anything should happen I can take care of myself. The doorman must have been bribed*.) (GreenForest Journal, 2016)

- Lexical means – modal words (*maybe, perhaps, possibly, probably*) (e.g. *Perhaps he has something on his conscience, and wants advice. I don't talk through my hat like maybe you think*.) and other words (nouns, adjectives, verbs) of modal semantics, which introduce subordinate clauses and act as predicators (*wish, it's time, possible, probable, chance, possibility*, etc.) (e.g. *It's time we were moving. It's possible there might be large changes around*

here. The chances are you have chilled the rooms upstairs.) (GreenForest Journal, 2016)

– Syntactic types of sentences and subordinate clauses (imperative sentences, clauses introduced by conjunctions as *if/as though*, conditional clauses, etc) (e.g. *Take it easy! She really looks sometimes as if she isn't all there. If we all looked our real selves the world would be uninhabitable*.) (GreenForest Journal, 2016)

– Different combinations of the above means (examples above).

– Intonation, prosody.

We have seen then, that many of the features associated with modality are not marked morphologically, but lexically or syntactically, or both. In this case we have to deal with the mixed system of means expressing modality.

II.2. Semantic and pragmatic and lexico-grammatical features of modality

Communicative-pragmatic study of language is based on a system-structural understanding of its multi-level organization, but provides new opportunities in the transfer of communicatively significant meanings during communication between partners (Depraetere, 2012).

The researcher calls the pragmatic space of language the extensive zone where language captures various attitudes of the speaker to reality, and the language user in the process of communication: a) names, b) indicates, c) expresses these relations, and the addressee perceives and interprets these meanings (Depraetere, 2012).

The pragmatic aspect of a persuasive speech act also includes a number of sociolinguistic factors (Depraetere, 2012):

1. distribution of communicative roles between the participants of the speech act;
2. distribution of social roles between communicators;
3. the nature of interpersonal relations, depending on the degree of social and psychological distance between communicants;
4. attitude of the communicators to the specified action.

Here are some examples. The first of these illustrate what Huddleston (2002) has called *pragmatic strengthening* and *pragmatic weakening*:

– *You **may** stay now*. (work conversation) (Swan & Walter, 2002)
– *You **must** try the new cake*. (Swan & Walter, 2002)

Both concepts here are quite transparent. Although *may* expresses possibility and modality, in the context in which the clause in sentence 1 is spoken, its meaning is strengthened to modal necessity. The example in this case will be interpreted as an instruction rather than a mere permission (Huddleston, 2002).

The second sentence illustrates the opposite pragmatic effect: *must* in this case does not convey its meaning of necessity, but rather gives it the meaning of possibility and it will be taken as a suggestion rather than a command (Huddleston, 2002).

The following examples (Huddleston, 2002) show us how combining a modal with another lexical item can increase the strengthening/weakening effect:

– *Of course, this way of looking at things reflects my own bias as an only partially reconstructed neurochemist; in practice the neurophysiology may well lead – indeed, in the important cases of Aplysia and long-term potentiation discussed next, has led – the biochemistry and cell biology, pointing the way towards cells whose electrical properties and therefore their biochemical properties change during memory formation.* (Swan & Walter, 2002)

– *In these days of widespread family planning, you might well think the number of unwanted pregnancies is on the decline. You would be wrong.* (Swan & Walter, 2002)

In the first sentence *may well*, and in the second sentence *might well*, which provoked pragmatic reinforcement. Even though the situation is presented as possible, the context makes it clear that there is a certain degree of inevitability, and therefore an air of necessity or even facticity appears (Huddleston, 2002).

A final observation is that certain sentences with modal verbs have acquired a formulaic status and thus no longer convey the meaning they literally expressed. *If I may* construction is one of the famous cases where the *if*-statement is no longer a request for permission. On the contrary, permission is already taken for granted (Collins, 2009).

The last given examples differ from the previous ones in that the meaning of the modal verb is not weakened (from necessity to possibility) and not strengthened (from possibility to necessity). The peculiarity here is that asking for permission amounts to taking permission for granted (Collins, 2009).

Another feature of modality is amplification. In English grammar, pairs of modal forms are often combined by necessity, and the differences between them are explained in terms of modality strength (Cappelle, 2010). Example:

– *I've got to/should call my dad.* (Swan & Walter, 2002)

– *She is to/ought to report directly to me in such circumstances*. (Swan & Walter, 2002)

For example, one modal construction (*have got to in, be to in*) expresses a stronger necessity than another (*should, ought to*) in the sense that the pressure on the addressee is more convincing when a "stronger" modal verb is used (Swan & Walter, 2002).

Here, clearly, the meaning effect is captured in terms of the illocutionary force of the utterance in which the modal features. Collins (2009) gives similar examples with *can, could* and *might* and argues that they should be set apart in a separate class of dynamic modality because they imply a directive speech act (Facchinetti 2002):

– *And you **may** remember that the organisations the republics were in the Soviet Union competed in the recent Winter Olympics under the title Commonwealth of Independent States*. (Swan & Walter, 2002) – The literal meaning of *may* […] is dynamic, but a more satisfactory interpretation requires reference to its directive illocutionary force.

– *Well I **can** write on your behalf*. (Swan & Walter, 2002) – an offer.

– *In your letter to me you say that – it is not the ownership of the NRMA that is under review. **Could** you explain that to me please*? (Swan & Walter, 2002) – a request.

– *Now if that is the form that your publication is going to take um then one of the things that you might also think about as an adjunct to your address is the use of audio-visuals or at least visuals*. (Swan & Walter, 2002) – a suggestion.

The authors cited are not the only ones to have signaled examples of this type, in which the modal meaning of (various types of) possibility of the verbs is superseded by a characterization in terms of the illocutionary force of the utterance in which they occur (Verhulst & Heyvaert, 2013).

The observations on strength have so far highlighted the following points: first, one might try to attribute inherent, context-independent strength to specific

modals, with a continuum from "very strong" to "weak" (Verhulst & Heyvaert, 2013). A scale such as the following might result from an approach along these lines [picture1.]:

very strong	strong	weak
must *have got to* *be to*	*have to*	*be supposed to* *ought to* *should*

Picture 1.

However, this leaves us with modal verbs such as want to, need to and need, the location of which on the cline is not straight forward. A second issue, with respect to the modals that are positioned in the same area on the scale of modal strength, is that of determining the contextual clues which make it possible to differentiate the modals, either in terms of more delicate distinctions concerning modal strength or in terms of other features (Verhulst & Heyvaert, 2013).

Portner (2009) singles out three aspectual plans of modality:

1. Relation of the content of the statement to reality from the speaker's point of view.
2. the speaker's attitude to the content of the utterance.
3. the relation of the subject to the action.

The last aspect is of particular importance, as it is expressed by modal verbs ("must", "can" and others). The first and second types of modality in linguistics are classified as "external modality", and the third type – as "internal modality" (Portner, 2009). The following types of modality are listed in the dictionary of linguistic terms:

1. Hypothetical modality (hypothetical (suppositional) modality) – representation of the content of the statement.
2. Verbal modality – a modality expressed by a verb.
3. Irreal modality – the content of the statement is impossible.

4. Negative modality – representation of the content of the statement as a non-relative reality.

One of the special means of expressing modality and the main one in the case of objective modality is the grammatical category. It is defined as "a significant opposition of repeated verb forms that express modal values in a grammatical way" (Portner, 2009). The main means of expressing the real objective modality are the tense forms of verbs in the real mood. Irreal objectively modal meanings are expressed by forms of the conditional mood of verbs (Portner, 2009).

The English conditional method is mostly considered as a complex, although it has three varieties that differ in their typical constructions (Butterfield, 2015):

1. *Subjunctive Mood* (conditional mood), which denotes an imaginary action that is not possible (at all or in a certain situation). This form is formed with the same verb forms used in the Past Indefinite (and Past Perfect Indefinite). Example: *If I were you, I would call her; I wish I were present.*

2. *Conditional Mood* is used to indicate actions that do not happen or did not happen because there were no suitable conditions for it or these conditions were not possible in a certain situation, that is, unrealistic. It is formed with the help of the auxiliary verbs *would/should*/the infinitive of the meaningful verb. Example: *What would you answer if you were asked*?

3. *Suppositional Mood* is used to express an action that may happen in the future, but there is no certainty about the reality of this event. It is formed with the help of the auxiliary verb should for all persons and the infinitive. Example: *Should you meet him, tell him to come.*

Functioning in a simple sentence is most often associated with the speaker's desire to remove the categorical nature of the statement and with politeness formulas, although in these cases it is also possible to express an unrealized action, the condition of which follows from the general context (Verstraete, 2000): *I should say so; Would you be so kind as to tell me?; You can not start now: you would get lost in the dark.*

One of the means of expressing subjective modality in the English language is modal words (lexical means of expressing modality) and verbs (lexico-grammatical means of expressing modality) (Verstraete, 2000). At the lexical level, modality is expressed using modal words: *certainly, of course, no doubt, surely, apparently, indeed, evidently, naturally, obviously, really, actually, happily/unhappily, luckily/unluckily, fortunately/unfortunately* and others. (Verstraete, 2000)

Modal words convey the speaker's subjective attitude to the statement, express the speaker's assessment, the relationship between the assertion in the sentence and reality. This assessment can be represented by a different degree of confidence, doubt, desirability of the action expressed in the sentence (Portner, 2009).

Modal words express the attitude of the speaker to the reality and possibility of the action in question. The essence of modal relations is how the speaker thinks, understands, qualifies his message, how he relates to reality in order to ensure the effectiveness and relevance of the main means of communication. According to Butterfield (2015), modal words can be divided into:

– words that express confidence: *certainly, no doubt, surely, apparently, undoubtedly*;

– words-intensifiers: *evidently, obviously, really, actually*;

– words that express uncertainty: *perhaps, maybe, probably*;

– words that express approval and disapproval: *happily/unhappily, luckily/unluckily, fortunately/unfortunately*;

In addition to dialects, modal values in English can also be expressed using other parts of speech (Butterfield, 2015): nouns (*There is a slight possibility that Sandy is home*); adjectives (*It is far from necessary that Sandy is home*).

Modality in English can also be expressed by syntactic means. First of all, these are various introductory words and constructions (phrases and sentences) that express the interlocutor's assessment of the content of the message (Butterfield,

2015). For example: *to my mind, in my opinion, I believe, I assume, I suppose, to tell the truth, frankly speaking, it is common knowledge*.

It is obvious that the named means of expressing modality are rather semantic and syntactic.

The syntactic and intonational means of expressing modality in the English language include various types of questions pronounced with a certain intonation. Thus, falling intonation in tag questions means a greater degree of confidence of the speaker in presenting an idea – so great that he, in fact, does not expect an answer to his question, make it rhetorical (Butterfield, 2015).

The means of expressing modality listed above refer to explicit means. Different shades of modality in speech can be transmitted implicitly, that is, non-verbally. Intonation is an implicit means of expressing modality in speech. Emotional-expressive assessment, the entire range of "subjective-objective relationships" and emotional-volitional manifestations are taken as a basis when studying modality in prosody; what many foreign authors denote by the term "attitude" and which constitutes the basis and essence of the "modal", "attitudinal" or "emotionally expressive" function of intonation (Verhulst & Heyvaert, 2013).

It is obvious that intonation is closely related to emotional speech, in which different emotional shades are conveyed by a peculiar intonation design. In addition to emotionally saturated language, it is also characteristic of emotionally neutral language, in which the degree of emotionality is insignificant. The intonation of an emotionally neutral language makes it possible to establish certain criteria of the intonation system of speech in general, to determine the functions of speech intonation. Since intonation is the main means of expressing emotions in speech, its meaningful repertoire is able to reflect dozens of modal values (Verhulst & Heyvaert, 2013).

Conclusions to Chapter II

In Chapter II, we solved the following tasks:

1. To analyze means of expressing modality in Modern English language.

2. To analyze semantic, pragmatic and lexico-grammatical features of modality.

According to the above points, we also established that the function of modal verbs in a sentence is official. They indicate the possibility, ability, probability, necessity of an action, which is itself expressed by a substantive verb. Thus, modal verbs are combined with the infinitive and together with it form a complex modal predicate.

According to the form, modal words do not have any specific external feature. But the other two features, semantic and syntactic, are presented clearly enough, which allows many linguists to separate them into a separate part of the language.

It can also be concluded that the semantic feature of modal words is their meaning of subjective relation to the statement from the point of view of its reliability, approximation, desirability. A modal word performs the function of an interjection part of a sentence, much less often – a sentence word.

We also established that different shades of modality in speech can be transmitted implicitly (non-verbally).

CONCLUSIONS

The Term Paper was written on the topic "Means of expressing modality in Modern English".

Having conducted a thorough analysis of the theoretical works selected in advance, the following conclusions were made:

1.   Modality is a complex multifaceted functional-semantic category that expresses the speaker's attitude to what is being said, his assessment of the attitude to objective reality. The content of what is expressed can be considered as real or unreal, possible or impossible, necessary or probable, desirable or undesirable, etc.

2.   Modality is differentiated into objective and subjective. Subjective modality, in contrast to objective modality, is an optional feature of speech and is expressed by such means as: word order, intonation, lexical repetitions, modal words and verbs, exclamations, interjections and word combinations, interjections, order of words in a sentence.

3.   There are grammatical and lexical means of expressing modality in Modern English. Grammatical means are such modal verbs as *must, should, ought, will/would, can/could, may/might, need*. At the same time, these verbs weaken their original meaning of desirability, obligation, necessity, etc. and convey only the attitude of the speaker to the content of the assumption as a whole. Modal verbs convey different shades of modality, starting with an assumption bordering on certainty and ending with an assumption in which the speaker is not sure.

4.   Using modal verbs is not very easy in order to find the right one for the meaning the speaker want to create and to interprete to the public. It is not only about the knowledge of all existing modal verbs or full verbs. The speaker needs to feel the differences and the slight nuances in meaning of the phrases. These slight differences can be invisible for untrained speaker and bring him many misunderstandings as in English the same phrases used in different situations can mean a big difference. That is why it is extremely important to understand the modalities of the modals and use them in the proper way.

5.   A special role in the transfer of evaluative values belongs to subjective-modal forms – interjections and parenthesis, exclamations and particles, which specialize in the transfer of subjective modality. It is necessary to clearly distinguish the concepts of interjections and parenthesis.

6.   Modality can be expressed implicitly and explicitly, from the point of view of the presence of the subject in the sentence can be agentive and non-agentive, direct and indirect.

LIST OF REFERENCE MATERIALS

1. Alexander L. G. (2001). Longman English Grammar Practice for Intermediate Students. Pearson Education Limited.

2. Cappelle, B. & G. De Sutter. (2010). Should vs. ought to. In B. Cappelle & N. Wada (eds), Distinctions in English linguistics, offered to Renaat Declerck. Tokyo: Kaitakusha, 126 p.

3. Collins, P. (2009). Modals and quasi-modals in English. Amsterdam & New York: Rodopi.

4. Depraetere, I. & C. Langford. (2012). Advanced English grammar. A linguistic approach. London: Bloomsbury.

5. Depraetere, I. & A. Verhulst. (2008). Source of modality: A reassessment. English Language and Linguistics 12 (1): 25 p.

6. Facchinetti, Roberta; Krug, Manfred; Palmer, Frank (eds.). (2003). Modality incontemporary English. Berlin, New York.

7. Facchinetti, R. (2002). Can and could in contemporary British English: A study of the ICE-GB corpus. In P. Peters, P. Collins & A. Smith (eds), New frontiers of corpus research. Papers from the twenty first International Conference on English Language Research on Computerized Corpora, Sydney 2000. Amsterdam and New York: Rodopi, 246 p.

8. Fintel, Kai von. (2006). Modality and Language. In Encyclopedia of Philosophy, 2nd ed. D. M. Borchert: MacMillan.

9. Graeme Kennedy. (2014). An Introduction to Corpus Linguistics, Routledge.

10. Griffiths, Patrick. (2006). An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

11. Huddleston, Rodney and Pullum, Geoffrey K. (2002). The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

12. Hoye, Leo. (1997). Adverbs and modality in English. London: Longman.

13. Huddleston, Rodney (1976). Some theoretical issues in the description of the English verb.

14. Jeremy, Butterfield (2015). Fowler's Dictionary of Modern English Usage (4th ed.). Oxford University Press. 853 p.

15. Kratzer, A. (2012). Modals and conditionals. Oxford University Press.

16. Leech, G., Svartvik, J. (2002). A Communicative Grammar of English. Third Edition. London: Longman.

17. Modal verbs in English. (2012). In Bright Hub Education. Retrieved from: http://www.brighthubeducation.com/esl-lesson-plans/37641-modal-verbs-in-english/

18. Palmer, Frank. (2003). Modality in English: Theoretical, descriptive and typologicalissues. Modality in Contemporary English. New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 17 p.

19. Palmer, Frank (2001). Mood and Modality 2d ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

20. Portner, P. (2009). Subjective vs. objective modality: What is the difference? In: Michael Fortescue, Peter Harder and Lars Kristoffersen, eds., Layered structure and reference in a functional perspective, 97 p.

21. Portner, P. (2009). Modality. Oxford University Press.

22. Verhulst, A., I. Depraetere & L. Heyvaert. (2013). Source and strength of modality: An empirical study of root should, ought to and be supposed to in present-day British English. Journal of Pragmatics 55: 225 p.

23. Verstraete, Jean-Christophe. (2000). Subjective vs objective modality in Functional Grammar: Criteria, types, and unmarked options. Presented at the 9th International Conference on Functional Grammar.

24. Watkins M. (1991). Practise Your Modal Verbs. Mike Watkins. Longman, 59 p.

LIST OF DATA SOURCES

25. GreenForest Journal. (2016). Retrieved from: https://greenforest.com.ua/journal/read/modals-of-deduction-past-present

26. Swan M., Walter C. (2002). How English Works. Oxford University Press.

27. Poe E. A. (1843). The Black Cat. Adaptation of 2021.

РЕЗЮМЕ

Дослідження на тему «Засоби вираження модальності в сучасній англійській мові» присвячене вивченню та аналізу поняття «модальності», її особливостей, лексико-граматичних засобів вираження та семантико-прагматичних особливостей в сучасній англійській мові. Курсова робота складається зі вступу, двох розділів (з підпунктами), висновків до кожного з розділів, загальних висновків та списку використаних джерел.

Перший розділ «Теоретичні засади модальності в англійські мові» (**«THEORETICAL FOUNDATIONS OF MODALITY IN ENGLISH»**). У ньому розглядаються основні положення поняття модальності, його функції в мові (у складі речення як комунікативної одиниці) та особливостей.

Другий розділ «Функціональні особливості модальності. Засоби її вираження в сучасній англійській мові» («**FUNCTIONAL PECULIARITIES OF MODALITY. MEANS OF ITS EXPRESSION IN MODERN ENGLISH**»). У ньому проводиться аналіз лексико-граматичних, семантичних та прагматичних особливостей модальності.

Ключові слова: *модальність, граматична категорія, засоби вираження, лексичні засоби, граматичні засоби, семантика, прагматика, дієслово*.