

FILOZOFICKÁ FAKULTA UNIVERZITY  
PALACKÉHO

KATEDRA ANGLISTIKY A AMERIKANISTIKY

THE COMPARISON OF MODAL VERBS  
IN ENGLISH, SPANISH AND CZECH  
LANGUAGE

(Bakalářská práce)

Autor: Pavel Herinek

Vedoucí práce: Mgr. Michaela Čakányová, Ph.D.

2020

**The comparison of modal verbs in English, Spanish and Czech language  
(Bakalářská práce)**

Autor: **Pavel Herinek**

Studijní obor: Anglická filologie – Španělská filologie

Vedoucí práce: **Mgr. Michaela Čakányová, Ph. D.**

Počet stran: 57

Počet znaků (bez mezer): 84 746

Olomouc 2020

Prohlašuji, že jsem práci vypracoval samostatně a uvedl úplný seznam citované a použité literatury.

V Olomouci dne 7. 5. 2020

**Pavel Herinek**

Děkuji své rodině za podporu během studia, a své vedoucí práce, Mgr. Michaele Čakányové, Ph.D., za veškeré rady, připomínky a konzultace poskytnuté během psaní bakalářské práce.

V Olomouci dne 7. 5. 2020

**Pavel Herinek**

## **Abstract**

The aim of this bachelor thesis is to compare the modal auxiliary verbs in English, Spanish and Czech, three different languages which belong to three main European languages families – Germanic languages, Romance languages and Slavic languages, respectively. The bachelor thesis identifies the ways in which modal auxiliary verbs in the three languages differ from regular verbs and then introduces the modal auxiliary verbs one after another with special attention on their semantics, morphology, and syntax. In the end, it summarizes the previous information and compares the languages in regards the semantics, morphology, and syntax of their modal auxiliary verbs as a whole unit.

## **Key words**

modality, auxiliaries, verbs, semantics, morphology, syntax

## **Anotace**

Cílem této bakalářské práce je porovnat způsobová pomocná slovesa v angličtině, španělštině a češtině, třech různých jazycích, které náleží do třech nejdůležitějších evropských jazykových rodin – angličtina do germánských jazyků, španělština do románských jazyků a čeština do slovanských jazyků. Tato bakalářská práce identifikuje rozdíly, které v těchto třech jazycích existují mezi způsobovými pomocnými slovesy a běžnými slovesy, a poté představuje způsobová pomocná slovesa se speciálním zaměřením na jejich sémantiku, tvarosloví a skladbu. Na konci shrnuje předchozí informace a porovnává jazyky se zaměřením na sémantiku, tvarosloví a skladbu jejich způsobových pomocných sloves jakožto celku.

## **Klíčová slova**

modalita, pomocná slovesa, slovesa, sémantika, tvarosloví, skladba

# 1 Obsah

2	INTRODUCTION .....	9
3	ENGLISH MODAL AUXILIARIES .....	11
3.1	Introduction.....	11
3.2	Criteria .....	11
3.3	Can.....	13
3.3.1	Semantics.....	13
3.3.2	Morphosyntax .....	14
3.4	May.....	15
3.4.1	Semantics.....	15
3.4.2	Morphosyntax .....	16
3.5	Will.....	16
3.5.1	Semantics.....	16
3.5.2	Morphosyntax .....	17
3.6	Shall .....	18
3.6.1	Semantics.....	18
3.6.2	Morphosyntax .....	18
3.7	Could.....	19
3.7.1	Semantics.....	19
3.7.2	Morphosyntax .....	19
3.8	Might .....	20
3.8.1	Semantics.....	20
3.8.2	Morphosyntax .....	20
3.9	Would .....	20
3.9.1	Semantics.....	20
3.9.2	Morphosyntax .....	21
3.10	Should.....	21
3.10.1	Semantics.....	21
3.10.2	Morphosyntax .....	22
3.11	Must.....	22
3.11.1	Semantics.....	22
3.11.2	Morphosyntax .....	23
3.12	The comparison with regular verbs.....	24
4	SPANISH MODAL AUXILIARIES.....	25
4.1	Introduction.....	25

4.2	Criteria .....	25
4.3	Deber .....	28
4.3.1	Semantics.....	28
4.3.2	Morphosyntax .....	29
4.4	Deber de .....	30
4.4.1	Semantics.....	30
4.4.2	Morphosyntax .....	31
4.5	Tener que .....	31
4.5.1	Semantics.....	31
4.5.2	Morphosyntax .....	33
4.6	Haber de .....	34
4.6.1	Semantics.....	34
4.6.2	Morphosyntax .....	34
4.7	Haber que .....	35
4.7.1	Semantics.....	35
4.7.2	Morphosyntax .....	35
4.8	Poder .....	36
4.8.1	Semantics.....	36
4.8.2	Morphosyntax .....	37
4.9	The comparison with regular verbs.....	38
<b>5</b>	<b>CZECH MODAL AUXILIARIES.....</b>	<b>39</b>
5.1	Introduction.....	39
5.2	Criteria .....	39
5.3	Muset.....	42
5.3.1	Semantics.....	42
5.3.2	Morphosyntax .....	43
5.4	Moci.....	43
5.4.1	Semantics.....	43
5.4.2	Morphosyntax .....	44
5.5	Mít .....	45
5.5.1	Semantics.....	45
5.5.2	Morphosyntax .....	46
5.6	Smět.....	46
5.6.1	Semantics.....	46
5.6.2	Morphosyntax .....	47

5.7	Chtít .....	47
5.7.1	Semantics.....	47
5.7.2	Morphosyntax .....	48
5.8	Hodlat .....	48
5.8.1	Semantics.....	48
5.8.2	Morphosyntax .....	48
5.9	Umět.....	49
5.9.1	Semantics.....	49
5.9.2	Morphosyntax .....	49
5.10	The comparison with regular verbs.....	50
<b>6</b>	<b>THE COMPARISON.....</b>	<b>51</b>
6.1	Semantics .....	51
6.2	Morphology.....	52
6.3	Syntax .....	54
<b>7</b>	<b>REFERENCES.....</b>	<b>57</b>

## 2 INTRODUCTION

The modality is a very important aspect of the verb and its meaning, and it is studied by many linguists worldwide. It is, therefore, not surprising that the history of its study is long and eventful. Seel claims that it dates all the way back to Aristotle, the famous Greek thinker from 4<sup>th</sup> century BC (qtd. in van der Auwera and Zamorano Aquilar, 2016, 13). Aristotle's study of logics already involved the concepts of necessity and possibility, which are today still the basis of the study of modality. His work was continued two centuries later by Apuleius of Madaura, who drew the famous square of opposition.

They started the history of studying modality in logic, which persisted to Middle Ages. However, its introduction into linguistics had to wait until the sixteenth century, when a Latin grammar in English called Lily's Grammar introduced the notion of a expressing mode through a new word (as opposed to morphology), which also included several of the modal auxiliaries of today (van der Auwera and Zamorano Aquilar, 2016, 8). This concept, however, was not universally accepted at the time, and hardly anyone considered the modality at all until the time of another famous thinker, Immanuel Kant. Kant considered modality to be a necessary part of judgment, and stated that every judgment has to be possible, real or necessary. Based on his theories, the scholars started linking modality with language for a while, but these approaches stopped in the early twentieth century.

The golden age of the study of modality started in 1970's, when several anglophone linguists like Leech, Halliday, Palmer (UK) or Fillmore (USA) started to use the term in its current meaning (van der Auwera and Zamorano Aquilar, 2016, 16). Palmer also introduced the two types of modality – the epistemic, which deals with the speaker's judgment of the truth in a proposition, and the deontic, which deals with the norms, expectations and desires of an individual. From that time on, modality went to be studied worldwide and continues to be an important part of linguistics into our days.

This work plans to follow this tradition of the linguistic study of modality and compare the modal auxiliaries in three European languages, English, Spanish and

Czech, from a grammatical standpoint. The modal auxiliaries will be considered based on their morphology, syntax and semantics.

The first chapter will focus on the modal auxiliaries in English, followed by the chapters focusing on modal verbs in Spanish and Czech, respectively. Each one of these chapters will start by introducing the existing rules for modal auxiliaries in the language, and then continue by introducing the language's modal auxiliaries and their semantics and morphosyntax, respectively. The work will then be closed by a final, shorter chapter, which will tie the previous chapters together and compare the three languages' semantics, then morphology and finally syntax, using the information from the previous three chapters.

With the reader's convenience in mind, this work will forgo the traditional division into the theoretical and practical part. Instead, the theoretical statements about the languages will be immediately followed by examples from contemporary language. The examples in the chapters concerning English and Spanish will be made with the help of language corpora named *Corpus of Contemporary American English* and *El corpus del Español: NOW*.

## 3 ENGLISH MODAL AUXILIARIES

### 3.1 INTRODUCTION

Modality can be indicated in two ways – modal inflections and modal auxiliaries (Palmer 2001, 104). In English, verbal mood hardly ever changes, and modal meanings are therefore mostly expressed by auxiliaries. This is not surprising, because English is a mostly analytical language and it does not rely too much on inflection.

### 3.2 CRITERIA

According to Quirk et al, there are nine fully modal auxiliaries in English – *can, may, will, shall, could, might, would, should and must* (1985, 120). These verbs have to fulfill two sets of criteria: the criteria for auxiliaries, which Huddleston and Pullum call ‘the NICE criteria’ (2002, 93), and the criteria reserved only for modal auxiliaries, described also in Huddleston and Pullum (2002, 106).

The acronym NICE stands for ‘negation’ (the auxiliary forms negation simply by adding the particle ‘*not*’), ‘inversion’ (the auxiliary is able to change positions with the pronominalized subject, most often in an interrogative question), ‘code’ (the auxiliary can stand for the full verb in short sentences, whose meaning cannot be determined without context) and ‘emphasis’ (the auxiliaries can be used solely to emphasize the meaning of the sentence), which in turn represent the four basic criteria for auxiliaries. The main criteria for modals are five: they only have primary forms, they do not agree grammatically with the subject, they require complements in form of bare infinitives, they occur in remote conditionals as the first verb in the apodosis and their preterites (if they exist) may be used much more freely to indicate modal remoteness.

The practical usage of modals is very restricted, because the morphology and grammar of modals is highly restricted. To show the peculiarities of the modals’ morphology, syntax and meaning in practice, we will use the examples of real sentences, taken out of Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA).

Let us first see the peculiarities of the modal auxiliaries as a group. As has been already mentioned in the previous part, there are five main criteria for modals. The

first of them, the absence of nonfinite forms, is demonstrated in the examples (3:1) to (3:6):

- (3:1) You can make the sauce up to five days in advance. (Detroit Free Press, 2017; COCA)
- (3:2) In those days, you could make up the sauce up to five days in advance.<sup>1</sup>
- (3:3) \*He cans make the sauce up to five days in advance.
- (3:4) \*You canning make the sauce up to five days in advance.
- (3:5) \*You will can make the sauce up to five days in advance.
- (3:6) \*You to can make the sauce up to five days in advance.

As we can see, modals cannot be in any nonfinite form, be it the infinitive, gerund participle or past participle. They are also unable to be marked for tense. The only exception, as the example (3:2) shows, is the past simple form (for the modals which have it). However, as Bybee says: ‘The English modal auxiliaries, *would*, *should*, *might*, and *could* are historically the Past Tense forms of *will*, *shall*, *may* and *can* respectively. However, their meaning and usage in Modern English are not derivable from the combination of past meaning with the meaning of the present modals’ (1995, 503). In the cases when they are not used to indicate past remoteness (which, in contemporary English, means in most cases), these four are considered a modal auxiliary of its own. The examples also prove the second criterion – since the modal auxiliaries cannot be marked for tense, there can be no *-s* ending to facilitate an agreement between the modal and the subject.

The third criterion, bare infinitival complements, is shown in the examples (3:7) to (3:11):

- (3:7) And it looks like **we might see** an isolated shower, an isolated storm. (NBC: Today Show, 2017; COCA)
- (3:8) I wonder if the spacecraft **might even see** its own shadow, which it’s done before, though it may be too distant for the shadow to be clear. (Slate Magazine, 2016; COCA)
- (3:9) \*And it looks like we **might to see** an isolated shower.
- (3:10) \*And it looks like we **might it**.
- (3:11) \*And it looks like we **might isolated**.

As we can see, the modal verb has to be followed by bare infinitive of another verb. This second verb, of course, cannot be another modal, since bare infinitives are secondary forms and as such aren’t compatible with a modal. The only exception

---

<sup>1</sup> If not specified otherwise, the examples are mine.

can be seen in the example (3:8) – the adverbs can follow the modal verb as well. In such a case, the bare infinitive has to immediately follow the adverb.

The fourth criterion can be seen in examples (3:12) to (3:14):

- (3:12) These joints, if I were a parent, would bother me. (Nerdist, 2017; COCA)
- (3:13) \*These joints, if I were a parent, bother me.
- (3:14) \*These joints, if I were a parent, have bothered me.

These examples show that in the remote conditional, the first verb of the apodosis – that is, the main clause expressing the consequence – has to be a modal auxiliary, not a full verb or a primary auxiliary. The most common modal verbs which appear in this position are *would* and *could*.

And the final criterion is demonstrated in the examples (3:15) to (3:19):

- (3:15) I have been studying West African percussion for about 20 years, and I play for dance classes around New York. (NPR: Wait Wait... Don't Tell Me!, 2017; COCA)
- (3:16) As a kid, I played hopscotch and jacks and permed my hair and hated football. (NPR: Hidden Brain, 2017; COCA)
- (3:17) Can you just stop and leave me alone? (Daily Beast, 2017; COCA)
- (3:18) I used to get really pissed off at people – like how could you just let me take your kids and then go on a bender? (Mother Jones, 2017; COCA)
- (3:19) What did you make of the latest episode? Could you make heads or tails of it? (Hollywood Reporter, 2017; COCA)

As these examples show, although the preterite of most verbs indicates that the action was happening in the past, the preterite of a modal verb is far more likely to indicate a modal remoteness than time remoteness. To cite Bybee again: ‘Even though these modals are Past in form, the past uses of most of them are the least frequent of their uses, and for *should*, one could argue that there are no past uses at all’ (1995, 504). However, as the example (3:19) shows, it can still signal time remoteness as well.

## 3.3 CAN

### 3.3.1 Semantics

We are now going to analyze all the full (central) modals in English from the point of view of their semantics, morphology and syntax. The first of them is *can*. Regarding the possible meanings of this modal, Aarts claims it has three main ones (2006, 275). This auxiliary is concerned with what can be called either root or event modality; out of the two types of event modality recognized by Palmer, the primary

meaning of this auxiliary is dynamic, since it is to indicate ability (3:20). It can also have a deontic meaning, in which case it indicates permission (3:21). However, these are not the only meanings. As Palmer puts it:

‘Ability ... has to be interpreted rather more widely than in terms of the subjects’ physical and mental powers, to include circumstances that immediately affect them. ... This can be seen in the contrast between deontic and dynamic CAN, where deontic CAN indicates permission, while dynamic CAN may indicate not merely ability, but also the possibility in more general sense.’ (2001, 10).

This identifies the third meaning as a possibility (3:22); however, since this possibility is related to actualization of situations, not the truth value of the proposal, the possibility is root and not epistemic (the sentence doesn’t focus on ability, but circumstances, namely the existence of a body of water). Additionally, the meaning of epistemic possibility exists as well, only it is not as frequent as the first three (3:23). In case of epistemic modality the speaker is judging the truth value of the claim ‘He killed the victim.’

(3:20) All dogs can swim, right. (Fox: The Five, 2017; COCA)

(3:21) People attending can enter and leave at any time, including during the prayer. (Minneapolis Star Tribune, 2017; COCA)

(3:22) Here it’s good, because we can swim a little. (PBS: PBS Newshour, 2017; COCA)

(3:23) He can’t have killed the victim, I was with him all the time!

### 3.3.2 Morphosyntax

*Can* is a prototypical modal, which means its syntax is exactly as expected from the modal verb – it is positioned after the subject (3:24), unless the sentence is interrogative and the inversion takes place (3:25), and it is followed by its complement which has to be a verb (3:26), which is not modal (3:27), in bare infinitive (3:28). It cannot have another position (3:29).

(3:24) The thing to like about Oberholtzer is that he can get his fastball into low 90s which for a lefty is pretty good. (crawfishboxes.com, 2017; COCA)

(3:25) Where else can you read first hand experiences of regular people? (gardenrant.com, 2012; COCA)

(3:26) By the way, Abrams’ set-up of what you’re about to see is a lot better than any hype I can bestow upon this, so enjoy... (aintitcool.com, 2012; COCA)

(3:27) \*By the way, Abrams’ set-up of what you’re about to see is a lot better than any hype I can may upon this, so enjoy...

(3:28) \*By the way, Abrams’ set-up of what you’re about to see is a lot better than any hype I can to bestow upon this, so enjoy...

(3:29) \*By the way, Abrams’ set-up of what you’re about to see is a lot better than any hype I bestow can upon this, so enjoy...

In regards to morphology, it has the preterite *could*, which might however be considered a separate modal auxiliary depending on context (if it signals modal remoteness, like in the example (3:31), it is a separate modal auxiliary, but if it signals past time, like in (3:32), it is merely the past form of *can*), negative forms *can't* (3:33) (a form in which the auxiliary is combined with shortened negative particle *not*) and *cannot* (3:34), and a preterite negative *couldn't* (3:35). Let us look at the possible forms in the examples (3:30) to (3:36):

- (3:30) By punishing criminal offenders, the state **can** simultaneously accomplish two forms of deterrence. (Vanderbilt Law Review, 2017; COCA)
- (3:31) Therefore, a reviewer **could** have agreed with a portion of EPA's draft toxicological review concerning one topic (or one charge question) but disagreed with a different topic (or another charge question). (Public Administrations Quarterly, 2017; COCA)
- (3:32) Last run the bath was cool enough that I **could** do a small parts run without additional cooling. (forum.caswellplating.com, 2012; COCA)
- (3:33) He stressed that he '**can't** change the facts, which are usually pretty damning.' (Stanford Law Review, 2017; COCA)
- (3:34) He stressed that he **cannot** change the facts.
- (3:35) Last run the bath was so hot that I **couldn't** do a small parts run without additional cooling.
- (3:36) \*I**n** tell that I am cold.

As we can see, there are only five possible forms which could be used – this modal does not have a contracted form.

## 3.4 MAY

### 3.4.1 Semantics

The second of modal auxiliaries is *may*. This auxiliary is concerned with both epistemic and root modality. This is because the first of the three meanings mentioned by Aarts (2006, 275) indicates epistemic possibility (3:37), since the writer talks about the possibility that such affecting really happened, but it has two other meanings, which are both root modality. First of them is permission (3:38), and the second of them, similarly to the previously mentioned modal auxiliary *can*, is root possibility (3:39); the sentence once again speaks of circumstances, namely getting the water prepared for swimming.

- (3:37) However, this finding may be affected by sample bias. (Public Administration Quarterly, 2017; COCA)
- (3:38) You may enter without any obligation to social media accounts, though we may offer them as opportunities for extra entries. (Engadget, 2017; COCA)

(3:39) And tomorrow we will come and regulate it and filter it and you may swim.  
But it will be very cold. (Atlantic, 1995; COCA)

### 3.4.2 Morphosyntax

*May* is as prototypical as *can* in regards to its grammar; just like *can*, it occupies the position between the subject and the lexical verb in bare infinitive, which is its complement (3:40). The only exception is inversion, which happens in interrogative contexts (3:41):

(3:40) Following the thought of Schussler Fiorenza, we may conclude: The tomb is a symbol of the hopeless, helpless, depressed, and disappointed state of the disciples. (The Ecumenical Review, 2019; COCA)

(3:41) That's why I think it's good to ask the doctor, may I have your cell number? (CBS News: CBS This Morning, 2019; COCA)

However, it differs from other modal auxiliaries in its morphology, which is even more restricted than the morphology of the verb *can*. It has the preterite, *might* (3:43), which is once again considered a separate modal auxiliary if it signals past time, but its negative contracted form, *mayn't* (3:44), is very rare and for all intents and purposes almost nonexistent.

(3:42) Whatever abstract logic **may** suggest, a prudent legislator cannot disregard these facts of life in the enactment of a penal code. (Vanderbilt Law Review, 2017; COCA)

(3:43) What do you wish that President Reagan had done that you think **might** have been helpful? (NPR: Fresh Air, 2017; COCA)

(3:44) Drink up, laddie, cuz tomorrow ya **mayn't** be so lucky! (the movie *Wisest Man*, 1991; COCA)

(3:45) \*Abstract logic'y suggest anything.

As we can see, there are only three forms this time, and the negative contracted form is extremely rare - in COCA, there are only 12 dated examples of using the negative contracted present form, almost all of them in the works of fiction. There would also generally be a past negative form, which would in this case be *mightn't*, but since even the past forms of common modals are not used very often and *mayn't* is extremely rare in itself, this form is practically nonexistent.

## 3.5 WILL

### 3.5.1 Semantics

The third modal auxiliary on the list was *will*. This modal verb deals mainly with epistemic modality. Just like the previous two modal verbs, it has three possible meanings according to Aarts (2006, 276). The first two meanings are epistemic –

the first one is epistemic necessity, (3:46), since the writer assumes that the claim is already true, but the other one, predicting the future (3:47), is not so clear. As Aarts puts it: ‘It should be pointed out that *will* and *shall* (and *would* and *should*) used for prediction ... do not fit as comfortably in the paradigm of ‘either possibility or necessity of the truth of a proposition.’ Prediction does involve some judgment of likelihood, but it is not clear whether a prediction says that something is ‘necessarily’ or, rather, ‘possibly’ the case.’ (2006, 277) This means that when *will* marks the future, further classification than ‘epistemic’ is sadly impossible. The third meaning of *will* marks volition (3:48), as the writer talks about their decision, about something they wish to happen, and is therefore concerned with root modality.

(3:46) As the visitor will know by now, the image of Amadou Bamba holds secrets that are only available through deep study and devotion to work, peace, and perfection of the soul. (African Arts, 2017; COCA)

(3:47) Juries will not lightly find convictions that will lead to the severest types of sentences unless the resentments caused by the infliction of important injuries have been aroused. (Vanderbilt Law Review, 2017; COCA)

(3:48) I will win this for my mother, who died two years ago.

### 3.5.2 Morphosyntax

As far as grammar is concerned, *will* is as prototypical as the two other modal auxiliaries, occupying the same position (3:49) and requiring the bare infinitive as its complement (3:50).

(3:49) Finding consistency has been difficult, however, and Penn State will need it this week with games at Michigan and at home vs. Wisconsin. (The Detroit News, 2019; COCA)

(3:50) \*Penn State will consistency this week with games at Michigan and at home vs. Wisconsin.

It is, however, the most morphologically diverse from the three already mentioned modals, since it has not only the preterite *would* (3:52), which can also be a separate modal verb when it signals modal rather than time remoteness, the negative form *won't* (3:53), and the preterite negative form *wouldn't* (3:54), but also the shortened form *'ll* (3:55) and preterite contracted form *'d* (3:56).

(3:51) Yet, as we **will** demonstrate, victim-facing justifications for punishment are not applicable to all criminal offenses or instances of criminal misconduct. (Vanderbilt Law Review, 2017; COCA)

(3:52) He said he **would** leave the final ruling to the trial jury. (Vanity Fair, 2017; COCA)

- (3:53) Several former NFL players have said they **won't** allow their children to play football. (Chicago Sun Times, 2017; COCA)
- (3:54) He said he **wouldn't** leave the final ruling to the trial jury.
- (3:55) They'**ll** send me back to the warehouse and wipe my memory. (AI Magazine, 2017; COCA)
- (3:56) He said he'**d** leave the final ruling to the trial jury.

As we can see, the total of possible forms is six, which is the biggest number of possible forms so far.

## 3.6 SHALL

### 3.6.1 Semantics

The next modal verb is *shall*. According to Aarts, *shall* has only two main meanings, and they are distributed evenly between epistemic and root modality (2006, 276). The first meaning is predicting the future (3:57). As we have already mentioned in the part about *will*, in such a case it is impossible to classify it beyond epistemic. The other main meaning of this word is root possibility (3:58), since it does not speak about the future, but about the possibility of such an event. However, it also has another possible meaning, which is obligation (3:59).

- (3:57) By the middle of the 21st century, a team of fully autonomous humanoid robot soccer players shall win a soccer game, complying with the official rules of FIFA, against the winner of the most recent World Cup. (AI Magazine, 2017; COCA)
- (3:58) No money shall be drawn from the Treasury without congressional approval. (Public Contract Law Journal, 2017; COCA)
- (3:59) All employees shall follow our strict dress code.

### 3.6.2 Morphosyntax

In terms of grammar and morphology, *shall* is more restricted than the other auxiliaries. It has the position and the bare infinitival complement shared by them (3:60), but it only has the archaic negative contracted form *shan't* (3:62) – the preterite form, *should*, and its negative contracted form *shouldn't* have vanished from the contemporary language, and they only stay there as a separate modal auxiliary.

- (3:60) The first section reads: 'Equality of rights under the law shall not be abridged or denied by the United States or any state on account of sex.' (Washington Times, 2019; COCA)
- (3:61) For instance, the MPC states 'it **shall** be the policy of this State to assist small and disadvantaged businesses in learning how to do business with the State.' (Public Contract Law Journal, 2017; COCA)

(3:62) I kept my husband's books too, mostly biographies, though I know I **shan't** read them, especially his law books. (The Boston Globe, 2017; COCA)

As we can see, there are only two possible forms – the common form *shall* and the negative form *shan't*. There is no past form, nor is there a past negative form.

## 3.7 COULD

### 3.7.1 Semantics

The fifth modal auxiliary, and the first one which can also function as a preterite of another modal, is *could*. This modal verb also has two main meanings distributed between epistemic and root modality according to Aarts (2006, 275), but the meanings are different. In both cases, the verb expresses a possibility, but in the first case, the possibility is epistemic (3:63), because it judges the truth value of the sentence, while in the second case it is root possibility (3:64), as it is not concerned about the truth value of a claim, but it states that such an event would be possible to happen. Apart of those two main meanings, it has the possible meaning of suggestion (3:65), an advice the addressed person can either accept or refuse.

(3:63) Yeah, I have not yet heard the piece on the smoke detector, but that certainly could be true. (CBS: This Morning, 2017; COCA)

(3:64) Innumerable hypotheticals could be drawn that lead to similarly counterintuitive conclusions. (Vanderbilt Law Review, 2017; COCA)

(3:65) We are running out of bread; could you go to the store, please?

### 3.7.2 Morphosyntax

*Could* has the same syntactic qualities as the other modal auxiliaries (3:66), but the morphology is different. This is not surprising – since *could* originated as a preterite form of *can*, it makes sense it does not have a preterite form. However, just like most of the other modals, it has the contracted form, *couldn't* (3:68).

(3:66) I would hate to think that this young man could harm his own mother, however, you never really know anyone and unfortunately his neighbors and friends may not know him as well as they think. (abcnews.go.com, 2012; COCA)

(3:67) Instead, it provides hope that something **could** be learned by an approach based on the principles we develop in this paper. (The Journal of Real Estate Research, 2017; COCA)

(3:68) I **couldn't** even tell if I was cold. (The Seattle Times, 2017; COCA)

## 3.8 MIGHT

### 3.8.1 Semantics

Another modal auxiliary is *might*. This modal verb differs from all the others, because unlike them, it only has one main meaning mentioned by Aarts (2006, 276). This main meaning is to signalize the possibility of the proposal being true, in other words, the meaning of epistemic possibility (3:69). However, there is also another possible meaning, which is to show a suggestion (3:70), like for the previous modal.

- (3:69) Some might be happy to see the term go, which would avoid essentializing today's girls and young women in relation to century-old concepts and ideals, some tainted with racism and sexism. (The Atlantic, 2017; COCA)
- (3:70) You don't know what to do? Well, you might for example go to the cinema.

### 3.8.2 Morphosyntax

The syntactic qualities of *might* are unsurprisingly the same as those of the other modal verbs – the position between the subject and the main verb (3:71), the inversion with subject in questions (3:72), and the complement in form of a verb (3:73) which has to be in bare infinitive (3:74).

- (3:71) You might want to consider doing this. (food52.com, 2012; COCA)
- (3:72) Might he bring it to pro ball with Detroit? (The Detroit News, 2019; COCA)
- (3:73) I'm just guessing here but it might work. (food52.com, 2012; COCA)
- (3:74) \*I'm just guessing here but it might to work.

The morphology, on the other hand, is the most restricted out of all modals – there is only the rare contracted form *mightn't*.

- (3:75) How one **might** improve the world beyond a superficial awareness remains unclear, but, baby steps. (The Verge, 2017; COCA)
- (3:76) But whether or not he can eat an apple... well, that might be a spoiler if we knew, **mightn't** it? (Nerdist, 2017; COCA)

## 3.9 WOULD

### 3.9.1 Semantics

The next modal verb is *would*, originally a preterite of *will*. Aarts, once again notes that this modal auxiliary has two possible meanings, and once again they are divided between epistemic and root modality (2006, 276). The first possible meaning is predicting the future (3:77), and as we already know from the first two cases, this meaning is impossible to classify beyond epistemic. The other possible meaning is

volition (3:78), since it states the person's preferences and wishes. We can therefore see that the meanings of *would* are very similar to the meanings of *will*; only the epistemic necessity is missing here.

(3:77) If true, this proposition would lead to the conclusion that varying punishment based on results would, in fact, lead to greater deterrence than would punishing the underlying action consistently. (Vanderbilt Law Review, 2017; COCA)

(3:78) The ying to his cousin Karnak's yang, Gorgon would rather fight than talk to solve his problems. (Hollywood Reporter, 2017; COCA)

### 3.9.2 Morphosyntax

Syntactic properties of this modal auxiliary do not change from the usual formula. The auxiliary has to be between the subject and the main verb in bare infinitive (3:79), unless there is inversion involved (3:80).

(3:79) Professor Wang Weifan wrote an article about what Chinese feminist theology would be like. (The Ecumenical Review, 2019; COCA)

(3:80) And I wonder, if you're commander in chief, would you continue the diplomacy that he has started? (CBS News: Face the Nation, 2019; COCA)

The morphology, however, is broader than what is usual for modal verbs which were originally only preterites of other modals – similarly to *will*, which we have discussed before, it has the contracted form *'d* (3:82), and it also has a negative contracted form, *wouldn't* (3:83), just like all the other modal verbs.

(3:81) **Would** that it were so simple! (Slate Magazine, 2017; COCA)

(3:82) And what's incredible about this is 46 percent of them say I'd prefer to have a broken bone, but even better than that is when you watch them make the decision, even those who give the right answer, those who say that I'd rather have a broken phone, agonize over this decision. (NPR: Fresh Air, 2017; COCA)

(3:83) But the photo also **wouldn't** have been possible without some preparation. (The Verge, 2017; COCA)

As we can see, in addition to the common form, the existence of both the negative and contracted form has been clearly shown.

## 3.10 SHOULD

### 3.10.1 Semantics

The eighth modal auxiliary is *should*. Once again, it has two main meanings, one of them being root necessity (3:84), the need for the events to happen, and one of them epistemic necessity (3:85). The example (3:85) is the latter because it deals with whether the proposal is true or not. We can therefore say that it is primarily an

auxiliary of necessity. It is quite similar to *shall*, with the difference that the epistemic meaning of *shall* is impossible to classify further. Unlike *shall*, however, it has two other possible meanings. One of them, very typical for the ‘preterite’ modals, is suggestion (3:86), while the other one is obligation (3:87). The difference is that the first one is an advice which the addressed is free to dismiss, while following the advice in (3:87) is actually required.

- (3:84) The decision should force both states and political subdivisions of those states to reconsider their taxing systems in light of the Court’s decision. (The Tax Lawyer, 2017; COCA)
- (3:85) ‘When did you say it was made?’ the teller asked her. ‘Urn, yesterday or the day before.’ ‘It should be here, then. Do you have a bank number?’ (New England Review, 2015; COCA)
- (3:86) If you are sick, you should drink this tea, you will get better.
- (3:87) All the students should listen to the teacher and do their homework.

### 3.10.2 Morphosyntax

The syntactic properties of *should* are not different from the other full modals, as we can see in the next examples, which show the default position (3:88) and inversion (3:89) respectively:

- (3:88) The instrumentalization of aid and lack of consistency in terms of what it should be doing and how, seem to explain much of its indolence in solving poverty issues. (Business and Economic Horizons, 2019; COCA)
- (3:89) When should I consult my doctor about a diarrheal illness? (cdc.gov, 2012; COCA)

The morphological ones are also similar to the other modal preterites. As we can see, one of the two possible forms is the common form, *should* (3:90), and the other one of them is its negative form, *shouldn’t* (3:91).

- (3:90) These justifications are premised on the notion that the state **should** take the interests of victims into account when determining how severely criminal offenders **should** be punished. (Vanderbilt Law Review, 2017; COCA)
- (3:91) But this **shouldn’t** come at the cost of your current and future financial security. (OregonLive.com, 2017; COCA)

## 3.11 MUST

### 3.11.1 Semantics

The ninth and last fully modal verb is *must*. This is another modal auxiliary which is connected with the necessity, and Aarts claims that just like with many other modals, it has its two meanings divided evenly – one signals epistemic necessity

(3:92) and one signals root necessity (2006, 276). However, what he labels ‘root necessity’ are actually two different meanings – root necessity (3:93) and obligation (3:94).

(3:92) ‘None taken. You must know by now that they don’t care about us making... whatever these are.’ (Analog Science Fiction and Fact, 2016; COCA)

(3:93) If you want to become a doctor, you must study at a university.

(3:94) Therefore, IRIS process must be transparent, and the science employed to determine the HHRVs must be accurate and defensible. (Public Administration Quarterly, 2017; COCA)

### 3.11.2 Morphosyntax

Being a fully modal verb, its syntactic properties are the same as the syntactic properties of the other modals (3:95), but its morphology is the most restricted out of all modal auxiliaries which were not originally past forms. It only has the common form, *must* (3:96), and the negative form, *mustn’t* (3:97) – the past form, which remains with all the other modals which were not originally one, is not present (3:98).

(3:95) Ultimately, Bosa must stay healthy for an extended period before everything else can fall into place. (Bleacher Report, 2019; COCA)

(3:96) In order for retributivism to justify differential punishment, therefore, an offender **must** be more culpable when his actions bring about statutory harm than if he had engaged in the same behavior, and yet the statutory harm had not occurred. (Vanderbilt Law Review, 2017; COCA)

(3:97) I mean, the left has been arguing, Obama during his eight years arguing that we **mustn’t** do anything to anger people abroad, particularly the Muslim world. (Fox: The First 100 Days, 2017; COCA)

(3:98) \*We absolutely **musted** do so.

Although this modal auxiliary is not a modal preterite, and therefore it could have been expected to have a preterite of its own as well, this is not the case.

### 3.12 THE COMPARISON WITH REGULAR VERBS

	Semantics	morphology	complements	position in the sentence	NICE criteria
regular verb	unlimited set of meanings denoting generally actions	tense, aspect, voice, third person singular inflection	unlimited	after the subject, before objects and its other complements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not negated by only a negative particle</li> <li>- not inverted with subject in questions</li> <li>- not representing the rest of the sentence in short answers</li> <li>- cannot be emphasised</li> </ul>
modal verb	limited set of meanings denoting possibility, necessity, permission, obligation, ability, suggestion and volition	negative forms, shortened forms (only for will, shall, would, should), past forms (only for can, may, will and should), no tense, aspect, voice or third person singular inflection	only bare infinitive	between the subject and the regular verb, in questions before the subject, at the beginning of the apodosis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- negated by only a negative particle</li> <li>- inverted with subject in questions</li> <li>- they represent the rest of the sentence in short answers</li> <li>- can be emphasised</li> </ul>

**Table 1:** The comparison of modal verbs with regular verbs in English

## 4 SPANISH MODAL AUXILIARIES

### 4.1 INTRODUCTION

We have already studied the expression of modality in the English language, and now it is time to look at Spanish.

Spanish does not rely on modal auxiliaries as much, since the modal meaning is more often indicated by mood. Just like English, Spanish has three moods – indicative, subjunctive and imperative. However, while in English the indicative is used most of the time, in Spanish both indicative and subjunctive are used very often. Indicative is generally used for contexts of certainty, knowledge and reality, while subjunctive is generally used for contexts of uncertainty, not knowing and unreal situation. However, the distribution is complicated; the mood is varied depending on the verbs, nouns, or even adverbs in the sentence. Either way, this means lesser dependence on modal auxiliaries.

### 4.2 CRITERIA

In spite of that, Spanish also has a set of modal auxiliaries, tied to so-called ‘modal periphrases’. Bosque and Demonte define modal periphrases as a union of two or more verbs, which together form the nucleus of the predicate (1990, 3325). Such a nucleus is then formed by one full verb in impersonal form, which carries the lexical meaning, and one or more auxiliaries. These parts of the nucleus are essentially the modal auxiliaries and their complement.

The criteria for Spanish modal auxiliaries, which make them different from the normal verbs, however, differ from the modal auxiliaries in English. The one exception is the criterion that modal auxiliaries require infinitive as the complement. As Bosque and Demonte note, the infinitive cannot be substituted for nominal constructions (1990, 3326). We can see it in the first examples, using Corpus del Español (NOW):

- (4:1) *Tengo que confesar-lo: hacer un viaje de estos  
es agotador.* (divinity.es, 2019; NOW)  
have to<sub>1SG</sub> confess<sub>INF-it</sub> do<sub>INF</sub> a<sub>M.SG</sub> trip of this<sub>M.PL</sub>  
be<sub>3SG</sub> exhausting  
‘I have to confess: making such a trip is exhausting.’

(4:2) \**Tengo que eso: hacer un viaje de estos*  
*es agotador.*  
 have<sub>TO1SG</sub> that<sub>M.SG</sub> do<sub>INF</sub> a<sub>M.SG</sub> trip of this<sub>M.PL</sub>  
 be<sub>3SG</sub> exhausting

This rule, as we can see in examples (4:1) and (4:2), is essentially the same as the aforementioned English rule – if the infinitive cannot be substituted, the complement of the auxiliary has to be the infinitive. The only difference is that the complement is not a bare infinitive, since there is no particle to complete a ‘full infinitive’ in Spanish. The rest of the English criteria for auxiliaries does not work in Spanish, as we can see in examples (4:3) and (4:4):

(4:3) *Si fuera Zidane estaría preocupado por lo*  
*que ocurrió la temporada pasada.* (telemadrid.es, 2019;  
 NOW)  
 if be<sub>1SG.PST.SBJV</sub> Zidane be<sub>1SG.COND</sub> worried<sub>M.SG</sub> by it  
 that occur<sub>3SG.PST</sub> the<sub>F.SG</sub> season past<sub>F</sub>  
 ‘If I were Zidane, I would be worried about what occurred the last season.’

(4:4) *Tuvo que confesar-lo: hacer un viaje de estos*  
*es agotador.*  
 have<sub>TO1SG.PST</sub> confess<sub>INF-it</sub> do<sub>INF</sub> a<sub>M.SG</sub> trip of this<sub>M.PL</sub>  
 be<sub>3SG</sub> exhausting  
 ‘I had to confess: making such a trip is exhausting.’

The example (4:1) has already shown that the auxiliary has the verbal morphology, as the modal verb is there in the first person of the singular; (4:3) shows that the apodosis does not have to start with a modal auxiliary; and the example (4:4) shows that the preterite of modal auxiliaries signals time rather than modal remoteness in Spanish.

As for the NICE properties, they are not used to denote Spanish auxiliaries. Consider the examples (4:5) to (4:7):

(4:5) *Es más, yo no manejo mi cuenta personal*  
*ni general porque no tengo tiempo.*  
 (elbuho.pe, 2019; NOW)  
 be<sub>3SG</sub> more I not manage<sub>1SG</sub> my account personal  
 nor general because not have<sub>1SG</sub> time  
 ‘It’s more, I don’t manage my personal or public account, because I don’t have time.’

- (4:6) *¿Porqué no habla él que es quien se lo ha currado?* (diariocordoba.com, 2013; NOW)  
 why not speak<sub>3SG</sub> he that be<sub>3SG</sub> who he<sub>DAT</sub>  
 it AUX.3SG.PST work<sub>PTCP</sub>  
 ‘Why doesn’t he speak, as the one who worked on it?’
- (4:7) *Por ello es que aunque consumas carne sí tienes derecho a criticar a Rosalía.* (tribuna.com.mx, 2019; NOW)  
 for it be<sub>3SG</sub> that although consume<sub>2SG</sub> meat yes  
 have<sub>2SG</sub> right to criticize<sub>INF</sub> to Rosalía  
 ‘Because of this, although you eat meat, you do have right to criticize Rosalía.’

As we can see in the examples (4:5) and (4:6), in Spanish, the negation simply by adding a negative particle and the inversion with the subject in questions apply to regular words as well, and therefore they cannot be used to identify modal verbs. The example (4:7) shows that emphasis in Spanish is not accomplished by a modal auxiliary, but by the positive particle *sí*. The last of NICE criteria, code, is present for only some of the Spanish auxiliaries; it will be addressed at the individual modal verbs.

This is not to say, however, that Spanish has no criteria which distinguish the modal verbs from the common ones. The second of such rules (after the necessity of infinitival complement) is that the modal auxiliary cannot select any complements of the verb phrase; all of them have to be selected by the infinitive. This is caused by the fact that an auxiliary verb is not a full verb, and it is a universal feature.

The next two rules are connected with passives. We can see them in examples (4:8) and (4:9):

- (4:8) \**Ser detallada es tenido que por la lista.*  
 be<sub>INF</sub> detailed<sub>F.SG</sub> be<sub>3SG</sub> have to<sub>PASS</sub> by the<sub>F.SG</sub> list
- (4:9) *Se ha de ir a el médico, ya que se debe seguir un tratamiento específico.* (elconfidencial.com, 2019; NOW)  
 must<sub>PASS</sub> go<sub>INF</sub> to the<sub>M.SG</sub> doctor<sub>M</sub> since must<sub>PASS</sub>  
 follow<sub>INF</sub> a<sub>M.SG</sub> treatment specific<sub>M.SG</sub>  
 ‘It is needed to go to the doctor, since you have to undergo a specific treatment.’

The example (4:8) show that the auxiliary cannot be passivized by the verb *ser*, but *pasiva refleja* (a type of passive without overt subject), as we can see in (4:9), affects the whole predicate.

The three remaining rules are demonstrated by examples (4:10) to (4:12):

- (4:10) \**Lo que se debe es tener en cuenta el perfil de esta y a el tipo de público a el que se dirige.*  
 it that must<sub>PASS</sub> be<sub>3SG</sub> have<sub>INF</sub> in count the<sub>M.SG</sub>  
 profile of this<sub>F</sub> and to the<sub>M.SG</sub> type of  
 public to the<sub>M.SG</sub> that direct<sub>PASS</sub>
- (4:11) *¡No hay que visitar el profesor, no somos responsables por él!*  
 not have to<sub>3SG</sub> visit<sub>INF</sub> the<sub>M.SG</sub> professor not be<sub>1PL</sub>  
 responsible<sub>M.PL</sub> by he  
 ‘We do not have to visit the professor, we are not responsible for him!’
- (4:12) *¡Hay que no visitar el profesor, él dijo que no vengamos!*  
 have to<sub>3SG</sub> not visit<sub>INF</sub> the<sub>M.SG</sub> professor he  
 say<sub>3SG.PST</sub> that not come<sub>1PL.SBJV</sub>  
 ‘We have to not visit the professor, he said not to come!’

The example (4:10) shows that modal periphrases do not allow for what is called in Spanish emphatic relative structures (these are called pseudo-clefts in English, and are similarly incompatible); and the last rule, demonstrated by the examples (4:11) and (4:12), shows that negation in front of the modal verb affects the modal meaning, while negation behind it affects the claim itself.

There are several verbs which, together with an infinitive, fulfil all characteristics of periphrases, and are therefore unquestionable modal periphrases: *deber*, *deber de*, *tener que*, *haber de*, *haber que* and *poder* (Bosque and Demonte, 1990, 3337). The next course of action will therefore be to consider them in turn and examine their syntax and meaning. The morphology will not be examined, because as was already pointed out, the modal auxiliaries in Spanish have all the verbal morphology.

## 4.3 DEBER

### 4.3.1 Semantics

The first of Spanish modal auxiliaries is *deber*. According to Manual de la nueva gramática de la lengua española (Manual), there are two types of modality in Spanish – epistemic (also called impersonal or propositional) and radical (also called personal) (2010, 537). Out of these two types, which correspond to epistemic and deontic modality in English respectively, Manual puts *deber* among the radical (2010, 538), because it is concerned with the attitude to potential actions. Inside the

category of radical modality, there are three possible meanings for this verb – root necessity (4:13), obligation (4:14) and suggestion (4:15). You can see the meanings in examples (4:13) to (4:15):

- (4:13) *Todo sucede en el momento en que debe suceder.* (laprensagráfica.com, 2019; NOW)  
 all happen<sub>3SG</sub> in the<sub>M.SG</sub> moment in that  
 must<sub>3SG</sub> happen<sub>INF</sub>  
 ‘Everything happens in the moment when it has to happen.’
- (4:14) *Ángela recibe una carga semanal que le indica qué barrios debe visitar.* (eltiempo.com, 2019; NOW)  
 Ángela get<sub>3SG</sub> a<sub>F.SG</sub> cargo weekly that she<sub>DAT</sub>  
 indicate<sub>3SG</sub> what neighborhood<sub>PL</sub> must<sub>3SG</sub> visit<sub>INF</sub>  
 ‘Ángela receives a weekly cargo which indicates to her what neighborhoods she has to visit.’
- (4:15) *Si no conoces los Sims deberías probarlo, si ya los conoces, ¿para que vamos a opinar nada?* (vozpopuli.com, 2019; NOW)  
 if not know<sub>2SG</sub> the<sub>M.PL</sub> Sims must<sub>2SG.COND</sub> try<sub>INF</sub> it  
 if already the<sub>M.PL</sub> know<sub>2SG</sub> for what go<sub>1PL</sub> to  
 opine nothing  
 ‘If you do not know The Sims, you should try it, if you already know it, what for would we express an opinion?’

As we can see, the example (4:13) describes the attitude of certainty towards a hypothetical event, therefore it is root necessity, and the example (4:14) indicates that Angela is obligated to do something, it is therefore obligation. The example (4:15) shows a suggestion – the speaker suggests something to the hearer who doesn’t need to heed it.

### 4.3.2 Morphosyntax

The basis of the syntax of *deber* is typical for most modal auxiliaries – namely, the position between the subject and the main verb, unless an inversion takes place, and inability to take any other complements than a full verb in infinitive. However, there are certain intricacies, which will be demonstrated in examples (4:16) to (4:20):

- (4:16) *¿Debe Ángela visitar algunos barrios?*  
*Sí, debe.*  
 must<sub>3SG</sub> Ángela visit<sub>INF</sub> some<sub>M.PL</sub> neighborhood<sub>PL</sub>  
 yes must<sub>3SG</sub>  
 ‘Does Ángela have to visit some neighborhoods? Yes, she has to.’
- (4:17) *¿Se deben visitar algunos barrios?* \**Sí,*  
*se deben.*  
 must<sub>PASS</sub> visit<sub>INF</sub> some<sub>M.PL</sub> neighborhood<sub>PL</sub> yes  
 must<sub>PASS</sub>  
 ‘Is it needed to visit some neighborhoods? Yes, it is.’
- (4:18) *He visto tus hermosos videos de cumpleaños y debo haber llorado 20 veces.* (woman.es, 2019; NOW)  
 AUX.1SG.PRF see<sub>PTCP</sub> your<sub>PL</sub> beautiful<sub>M.PL</sub> video<sub>PL</sub> of  
 birthday and must<sub>1SG</sub> AUX.INF.PRF cry<sub>PTCP</sub> 20  
 time<sub>PL</sub>  
 ‘I have seen your beautiful birthday videos and I must have cried 20 times.’
- (4:19) \**Debes haber llorado 20 veces, el director te ordenó.*  
 must<sub>2SG</sub> AUX.INF.PRF cry<sub>PTCP</sub> 20 time<sub>PL</sub> the<sub>M.SG</sub> director  
 you<sub>DAT</sub> order<sub>3SG.PST</sub>
- (4:20) \**Me gustaría deber ayudar-os. / \*Voy a deber ayudar-os.*  
 I<sub>DAT</sub> like<sub>1SG.COND</sub> must<sub>INF</sub> help<sub>INF-youACC</sub> / go<sub>1SG</sub> to  
 must<sub>INF</sub> help<sub>INF-youACC</sub>

The example (4:16) shows that the necessary infinitival complement is not completely necessary; when it is already known from the context, it can be omitted. This phenomenon is known as ellipsis. However, as (4:17) demonstrates, this omission is not possible when the sentence is in *pasiva refleja* and plural. The example (4:18) shows that in addition to simple infinitives, *deber* is compatible with compound infinitives (which express past tense) as well, but as the example (4:19) shows, it cannot happen when the meaning of the auxiliary is obligation. And finally, the example (4:20) shows that the whole periphrasis cannot occur in a subordinate clause or after *ir a* (‘go to’ in English).

## 4.4 DEBER DE

### 4.4.1 Semantics

The next modal auxiliary is *deber de*. This auxiliary originates from the previous one and it is also similar, but while *deber* is concerned with deontic modality, *deber de* is concerned with epistemic. It only has one meaning, and the meaning is epistemic necessity. We can see it in the example (4:21):

(4:21) *Se debe de vivir mal en Moscú, ¿no?*  
 must<sub>PASS</sub> live<sub>INF</sub> bad in Moscow not  
 ‘It has to be bad to live in Moscow, hasn’t it?’

#### 4.4.2 Morphosyntax

Since *deber de* originated from *deber*, its syntactical properties are similar to the aforementioned auxiliary. However, there are still some differences. We can see them in examples (4:22) to (4:24):

- (4:22) *Se debe de vivir mal en Moscú, ¿no? \*Sí, se debe de.*  
 must<sub>PASS</sub> live<sub>INF</sub> bad in Moscow not yes  
 must<sub>PASS</sub>  
 ‘It has to be bad to live in Moscow, hasn’t it? Yes, it has to.’ (attempted)
- (4:23) \**¿Es verdad que Juan debe de estar a casa ahora?*  
 \**Sí, Juan definitivamente debería de estar a casa ahora.*  
 be<sub>3SG</sub> truth that Juan must<sub>3SG</sub> be<sub>INF</sub> in house now  
 yes Juan definitively must<sub>3SG.COND</sub> be<sub>INF</sub> in house  
 now
- (4:24) *¡Cállate! ¡Marco debe de estar durmiendo!*  
 shut up<sub>IMP</sub>-yourself Marco must<sub>3SG</sub> be<sub>INF</sub> sleep<sub>GER</sub>  
 ‘Shut up! Marco must be asleep!’

As we can see from the example (4:22), *deber de* does not allow for omitting the infinitive. The example (4:23) shows that it is incompatible with both the interrogative contexts and the conditional. This is because interrogative contexts and conditionals express doubt and probability, respectively. Both of these aspects are expressed by *deber de* as well, which means the omission of the superfluous auxiliary. On the other hand, the example (4:24) shows that this modal is compatible with the construction *estar + gerund*. In all the other aspects, the syntax of *deber de* is exactly the same as the syntax of *deber*.

## 4.5 TENER QUE

### 4.5.1 Semantics

The next modal auxiliary is *tener que*. This is the first auxiliary to express both epistemic and deontic modality. Similarly to *deber (de)*, it is connected to necessity, and therefore it expresses similar meanings as the two previous auxiliaries: epistemic necessity (4:25), root necessity (4:26) and obligation (4:27). We can see the meanings in the examples (4:25) to (4:27):

- (4:25) *El culpable tiene que ser el que tenía que arreglar el puente.* (tn.com.ar, 2019; NOW)  
 the<sub>M.SG</sub> guilty have to<sub>3SG</sub> be<sub>INF</sub> the<sub>M.SG</sub> that  
 have to<sub>3SG.IPFV</sub> repair<sub>INF</sub> the<sub>M.SG</sub> bridge  
 ‘The guilty has to be the one who had to repair the bridge.’
- (4:26) *Ahora tengo que esperar los resultados de la autopsia para ver si esa bebé llegó a respirar siquiera’, declaró Smith.* (elcomercio.es, 2019; NOW)  
 now have to<sub>1SG</sub> wait<sub>INF</sub> the<sub>M.PL</sub> result<sub>PL</sub> of  
 the<sub>F.SG</sub> autopsy for see<sub>INF</sub> if that<sub>F.SG</sub> baby  
 arrive<sub>3SG.PST</sub> to breathe<sub>INF</sub> at least declare<sub>3SG.PST</sub> Smith  
 ‘‘Now I have to wait for the results of the autopsy to see if the baby even started breathing,’’ declared Smith.’
- (4:27) *Si tienes que robar en el monte para alguien, te vistes con ropa de camuflaje.*  
 if have to<sub>2SG</sub> rob<sub>INF</sub> in the<sub>M.SG</sub> wilderness for  
 someone yourself dress<sub>2SG</sub> with clothes of  
 camouflage  
 ‘If you have to steal in the wilderness for someone, you will put camouflage clothing on.’

The example number (4:25) shows epistemic necessity, since it judges the truth value of the sentence as very likely. It also indicates that the likely turn of events is an inference on the part of the speaker. The example (4:26) is root necessity, since it indicates necessity due to circumstances, and (4:27) is obligation, since it indicates necessity due to the will of someone else.

We have already stated that *tener que* expresses the same general modal meanings as *deber (de)*. However, this does not mean that there are no differences. The differences are summed up in examples (4:28) to (4:30):

- (4:28) *\*Si debes robar en el monte para alguien, te vistes con ropa de camuflaje.*  
 if must<sub>2SG</sub> rob<sub>INF</sub> in the<sub>M.SG</sub> wilderness for  
 someone yourself dress<sub>2SG</sub> with clothes of  
 camouflage
- (4:29) *Debí decir-le, pero no lo hice.*  
 must<sub>1SG.PST</sub> say<sub>INF</sub>-he<sub>DAT</sub> but not it do<sub>1SG.PST</sub>  
 ‘I had to tell him, but I did not do it.’
- (4:30) *\*Tuve que decir-le, pero no lo hice.*  
 have to<sub>1SG.PST</sub> say<sub>INF</sub>-he<sub>DAT</sub> but not it do<sub>1SG.PST</sub>

As we can see in (4:28), the example (4:27) does not make much sense when we substitute *tener que* with *deber*. This is because *deber* expresses a moral obligation, one which should not be broken, and stealing goes against the traditional morality. Similarly, the example (4:29) does not make much sense with *tener que* instead of *deber*, as is the case in (4:30), because unlike *deber*, *tener que* in past tense expresses fulfilled obligation, and the second clause in the sentence says that the obligation was unfulfilled.

#### 4.5.2 Morphosyntax

The syntax of this verb is not very complicated. It has the basic syntax of the auxiliary, the position between subject and main verb, which is its complement, and several other rules, which are demonstrated in examples (4:31) to (4:34):

- (4:31) *Tienes que robar en el monte? \*Sí,*  
*tienes que.*  
 have to<sub>2SG</sub> rob<sub>INF</sub> in the<sub>M.SG</sub> wilderness yes  
 have to<sub>2SG</sub>
- (4:32) *Tenía que haber ayudado a Mercedes,*  
*pero no lo realicé en el momento.*  
*¡Qué pena! / Tendría que haber ayudado a*  
*Mercedes.*  
 have to<sub>1SG.IPFV</sub> AUX.INF.PRF help<sub>PTCP</sub> to Mercedes  
 but not it realize<sub>1SG.PST</sub> in the<sub>M.SG</sub> moment  
 what pity / have to<sub>1SG.COND</sub> AUX.INF.PRF help<sub>PTCP</sub> to  
 Mercedes  
 ‘I had to have helped Mercedes, but I did not realize it in the moment.  
 What a pity! / I would have to have helped Mercedes.’
- (4:33) *\*Tengo que haber ayudado a Mercedes.*  
 have to<sub>1SG</sub> AUX.INF.PRF help<sub>PTCP</sub> to Mercedes
- (4:34) *El madridista no tiene que estar*  
*preocupado, yo siempre soy positivo.* (marca.com, 2019;  
 NOW)  
 the<sub>M.SG</sub> person from Madrid not have to<sub>3SG</sub> be<sub>INF</sub>  
 worried<sub>M.SG</sub> I always be<sub>1SG</sub> positive<sub>M.SG</sub>  
 ‘A person from Madrid does not have to be worried, I feel always positive.’

The example number (4:31) shows that unlike *deber*, this modal auxiliary cannot omit the infinitive. The example (4:32) demonstrates that *tener que* is compatible with compound infinitives in imperfect and conditional; however, number (4:33) shows that other forms aren’t compatible. On the other hand, the example (4:34) shows that all the forms can be in front of *estar + gerund*.

## 4.6 HABER DE

### 4.6.1 Semantics

The fourth modal auxiliary is *haber de*. This auxiliary, which belongs mainly to the literary language, is once again connected to both epistemic and deontic modality. When epistemic, it signals epistemic necessity (4:35) similar to *tener que*, when deontic, it expresses root necessity (4:36) or obligation (4:37). We can see it in the next examples:

- (4:35) *¿Quién es el asesino? Hay de ser  
alguién de familia Cartwell, no les  
importa la moralidad.*  
who be<sub>3SG</sub> the<sub>M.SG</sub> killer must<sub>3SG</sub> be<sub>INF</sub>  
someone of family Cartwell not they<sub>DAT</sub>  
matter the<sub>F.SG</sub> morality  
'Who is the killer? It must be someone from the Cartwell family, the  
morality does not matter to them.'
- (4:36) *Hay de atraer clientes nuevos para la  
nuestra compañía, no tenemos bastante de  
ellos.*  
must<sub>3SG</sub> attract<sub>INF</sub> client<sub>PL</sub> new<sub>M.PL</sub> for the<sub>F.SG</sub>  
our<sub>F.SG</sub> company not have<sub>1PL</sub> enough of  
they  
'We must attract new customers for our company, we do not have enough.'
- (4:37) *El gobierno dice que hay de vender la  
agua por un precio mínimo, para que nadie  
falte la agua para beber.*  
the<sub>M.SG</sub> government say<sub>3SG</sub> that must<sub>3SG</sub> sell<sub>INF</sub> the<sub>F.SG</sub>  
water by a<sub>M.SG</sub> price minimal<sub>M.SG</sub> for that no one  
lack<sub>3SG.SBJV</sub> the<sub>F.SG</sub> water for drink<sub>INF</sub>  
'The government says that water must be sold for minimal prices, so that  
no one lacks water to drink.'

The first one of these examples, example (4:35), once again expresses epistemic necessity gained by inference of the speaker, while example (4:36) shows root necessity, because the necessity of such action is enforced by circumstances. (4:37) is an example of obligation.

### 4.6.2 Morphosyntax

The syntax of this verb is very easy. In addition to the basic position between the subject and the full verb, there are only few peculiarities, which can be seen in examples (4:38) to (4:40):

- (4:38) \**Habría de haber leído 20 libros para el examen.*  
 must<sub>3SG.COND</sub> AUX.INF.PRF read<sub>PTCP</sub> 20 book<sub>PL</sub> for  
 the<sub>M.SG</sub> exam
- (4:39) \**Me gustaría haber de ayudar-os. / \*Voy a haber de ayudar-os.*  
 I<sub>DAT</sub> like<sub>1SG.COND</sub> must<sub>INF</sub> help<sub>INF-you<sub>DAT</sub>.PL</sub> / go<sub>1SG</sub> to  
 must<sub>INF</sub> help<sub>INF-you<sub>DAT</sub>.PL</sub>
- (4:40) *¿Hay de atraer clientes nuevos? \*Sí, hay de.*  
 must<sub>3SG</sub> attract<sub>INF</sub> client<sub>PL</sub> new<sub>M.PL</sub> yes must<sub>3SG</sub>

The example (4:38) shows that unlike most other modals, *haber de* is not compatible with compound infinitives. This is because *haber de*, even with modal meaning, always leans towards the future, while compound infinitives express past meaning. (4:39) shows that similarly to *deber (de)*, it cannot occur in infinitive after *ir a* or in a subordinate clause, and finally, the example (4:40) shows that the infinitive cannot be omitted.

## 4.7 HABER QUE

### 4.7.1 Semantics

The next modal auxiliary is *haber que*. It expresses only deontic modality, namely obligation. See for yourself in the example (4:41):

- (4:41) *Es posible que no se tenga en un principio, pero hay que intentar-lo.*  
 (elperiodico.com, 2019; NOW)  
 be<sub>3SG</sub> possible that not have<sub>3SG.SBJV.PASS</sub> in  
 a<sub>M.SG</sub> beginning but have<sub>TO3SG</sub> try<sub>INF-it</sub>  
 ‘It is possible that it will not be achieved in the beginning, but it is necessary to try it.’

### 4.7.2 Morphosyntax

Although the meaning is fairly straightforward, its syntax is quite unique. For this reason, it is not always considered a modal auxiliary, although it fulfills most of the rules for auxiliaries in this work, including the position between the subject and the main verb. The specifics of syntax are in the following examples:

- (4:42) *Hay que traer-se-lo a él. / \*Se lo hay que traer a él.*  
 have<sub>TO3SG</sub> bring<sub>INF-he<sub>DAT</sub>-it</sub> to he / he<sub>DAT</sub> it  
 have<sub>TO3SG</sub> bring<sub>INF</sub> to he  
 ‘It is necessary to bring it to him.’ (in the last case attempted)

- (4:43) \*Es posible que no se tenga en  
un principio, pero es habido que intentar-lo.  
be<sub>3SG</sub> possible that not have<sub>3SG.SBJV.PASS</sub> in  
a<sub>M.SG</sub> beginning but be<sub>3SG</sub> have to<sub>PASS</sub> try<sub>INF-it</sub>
- (4:44) ??Hay que amanecer pronto, no puedo soportar la  
oscuridad más.  
have to<sub>3SG</sub> dawn<sub>INF</sub> soon not can<sub>1SG</sub> bear<sub>INF</sub> the<sub>F.SG</sub>  
darkness more  
‘It must dawn soon, I cannot stand the darkness anymore.’
- (4:45) Había que haber contar-lo. / Habría que  
haber contar-lo. / \*Hay que haber contar-lo.  
have to<sub>3SG.IPFV</sub> AUX.<sub>INF.PRF</sub> tell<sub>INF-it</sub> / have to<sub>3SG.COND</sub>  
AUX.<sub>INF.PRF</sub> tell<sub>INF-it</sub> / have to<sub>3SG</sub> AUX.<sub>INF.PRF</sub> tell<sub>INF-it</sub>  
‘It was necessary to have told them. / It would be necessary to have told  
them.’
- (4:46) \*Me gustaría haber que ayudar-os. / Voy a  
haber que ayudar-os.  
I<sub>DAT</sub> like<sub>3SG.COND</sub> have to<sub>INF</sub> help<sub>INF-you</sub><sub>DAT.PL</sub> / go<sub>1SG</sub> to  
have to<sub>INF</sub> help<sub>INF-you</sub><sub>DAT.PL</sub>  
‘I would like it to be necessary to help you. (attempted) / It is going to be  
necessary to help you.’

We can see that not all of the rules are fulfilled - the example (4:42) shows that unlike the other modals, this one does not permit the clitics to be positioned in front of it, and example (4:43) shows that this auxiliary cannot be in passive voice. This is because it is inherently impersonal, and only personal constructions can be in passive voice. As for the syntactic specifics which do not break the rules for modal auxiliaries, (4:44) shows that the verb which follows this auxiliary has to have an animate agent, because this construction covers it; (4:45) demonstrates that very much like *tener que*, this auxiliary is compatible with compound infinitives only in imperfect and conditionals; and finally, the example (4:46) shows that like *deber (de)* and *haber de*, *haber que* cannot be in infinitive in subordinate clauses. On the other hand, unlike them, it can follow the construction *ir a*.

## 4.8 PODER

### 4.8.1 Semantics

And the last modal auxiliary in Spanish is *poder*. This is a very important modal auxiliary, because unlike the previous modals, which are connected with modal necessity, *poder* is connected with modal possibility. As such, it can express both epistemic and deontic modality. Within epistemic modality, it expresses epistemic

possibility (4:47); within deontic modality, it can express root possibility (4:48), permission (4:49), suggestion (4:50) or ability (4:51). The examples are:

- (4:47) *Y puede ser así, solamente que no lo es todo.* (almomento.mx, 2019; NOW)  
 and can<sub>3SG</sub> be<sub>INF</sub> so merely that not it be<sub>3SG</sub>  
 all<sub>M.SG</sub>  
 ‘And it can be so, provided that this is not all.’
- (4:48) *Además, todos los grupos políticos somos muy conscientes de que no puede ser así.*  
 (canarias7.es, 2019; NOW)  
 moreover all<sub>M.PL</sub> the<sub>M.PL</sub> group<sub>PL</sub> political<sub>M.PL</sub> be<sub>1PL</sub> very  
 conscious<sub>M.PL</sub> of that not can<sub>3SG</sub> be<sub>INF</sub> so  
 ‘Moreover, we in the political parties are very much aware that it cannot be so.’
- (4:49) *No puede ser así desde el punto de vista de los clientes.* (cubadebate.cu, 2019; NOW)  
 not can<sub>3SG</sub> be<sub>INF</sub> so from the<sub>M.SG</sub> point of view  
 of the<sub>M.PL</sub> client<sub>PL</sub>  
 ‘From the point of view of the clients, it cannot be so.’
- (4:50) *¿No sabes qué hacer? Me puedes ayudar con el almuerzo.*  
 not know<sub>2SG</sub> what do<sub>INF</sub> I<sub>DAT</sub> can<sub>2SG</sub> help<sub>INF</sub>  
 with the<sub>M.SG</sub> lunch  
 ‘You do not know what to do? You can help me with the lunch.’
- (4:51) *Sí, ¡Pablo puede nadar! Aprendió nadar cuando era niño.*  
 yes Pablo can<sub>3SG</sub> swim<sub>INF</sub> learn<sub>3SG.PST</sub> swim<sub>INF</sub>  
 when be<sub>3SG.IPFV</sub> boy  
 ‘Yes, Pablo can swim! He learned to swim when he was a child.’

As we can see, the example (4:47) is epistemic possibility, because the speaker judges the possibility that in this case, the said claim is correct, while in the example (4:48), we have root possibility, because the speaker judges a general possibility enforced by circumstances. In (4:49), it is permission, because the clients are those who decide if they permit the event or not; in (4:50), it is a suggestion, because the addressed person is free to dismiss it; and in (4:51), it is an example of ability.

#### 4.8.2 Morphosyntax

The main interesting aspect of the syntax of *poder* is the fact that with the meaning of possibility, its syntactic qualities are different from those of different meanings. Let us see it in the examples (4:52) and (4:53):

- (4:52) \**Podía haber comido una paella. / Lo que dijiste puede haber estado correcto.*  
 can<sub>1SG</sub>.IPFV AUX.INF.PRF eat<sub>PTCP</sub> a<sub>F,SG</sub> paella / it  
 that say<sub>2SG</sub>.PST can<sub>3SG</sub> AUX.INF.PRF be<sub>PTCP</sub> correct<sub>M,SG</sub>  
 ‘I could have eaten a paella. (attempted) / What you said could have been true.’
- (4:53) *Estoy pudiendo entrar. / \*Marcos está pudiendo estar a casa ya.*  
 be<sub>1SG</sub> can<sub>GER</sub> enter<sub>INF</sub> Marcos be<sub>3SG</sub>  
 can<sub>GER</sub> be<sub>INF</sub> to house already  
 ‘I am being able to enter.’

As we can see, the *poder* meaning epistemic possibility is compatible with compound infinitives (4:52), but it cannot appear in gerund after *estar* (4:53).

#### 4.9 THE COMPARISON WITH REGULAR VERBS

	semantics	morphology	Complements	position in the sentence	NICE criteria
regular verb	unlimited set of meanings denoting generally actions	person, number, mood, tense, aspect, infinitive, passive/active voice and pasiva refleja, participles, gerund	unlimited	after the subject, before objects and its other complements	- negated by only a negative particle - inverted with subject in questions - represents the rest of the sentence in short answers - emphasised by a particle
modal verb	limited set of meanings denoting possibility, necessity, permission, obligation, ability and suggestion	person, number, mood, tense, aspect, infinitive, only active voice and pasiva refleja, participles, gerund	only simple infinitives and compound infinitives (only for <i>deber</i> , <i>tener que</i> , <i>haber que</i> , <i>poder</i> ),	between the subject and the regular verb, in questions before the subject, not at the beginning of the apodosis	- negated by only a negative particle - inverted with subject in questions - represents the rest of the sentence in short answers (only for <i>deber</i> and <i>poder</i> ) - emphasised by a particle

**Table 2:** The comparison of modal verbs with regular verbs in Spanish

## 5 CZECH MODAL AUXILIARIES

### 5.1 INTRODUCTION

The final language which we will consider from modal standpoint will be the Czech language.

Czech language also has three traditional moods, but the three moods, listed by Kořenský, Komárek et al., are indicative, imperative and conditional (1987, 166). Subjunctive, the mode connected with unreal situations and therefore with traditional modality, is missing. As a result, modality in Czech is generally not expressed by a change of mood. But even so, the expression of modality in Czech is very much unlike both English and Spanish, because here the modality is often expressed by other lexical, non-auxiliary means, especially adverbs and adverbial phrases, in addition to modal auxiliaries (Daneš et al. 1987, 280). As a result, the Czech language relies on the modal auxiliaries less than the English.

That being said, Czech has its own set of modal auxiliaries, which are called ‘true modal verbs’ by Daneš et al. (1987, 281). According to Daneš et al., there are seven of these verbs: *mušet*, *moci*, *mít*, *smět*, *chtít*, *hodlat* and *umět*. Since Czech negates the modality by negative prefix ‘ne-’, essentially forming a new word, all of them also have their negative counterpart. The negative counterparts are also modal, expressing the opposite of the modal meaning expressed by the positive verbs. This opposite of the modal meaning does not have to be a lack of modal meaning, it may also be a different modal meaning. This is because, as Daneš et al. mention, necessity and possibility are polar opposites (1987, 278), and therefore the opposite of necessity is automatically possibility. Such opposites are, for example, epistemic necessity and possibility, root necessity and possibility, or obligation and permission.

### 5.2 CRITERIA

Just like in both previous languages, modal auxiliaries differ from other verbs by fulfilling several criteria. The first few of them, which can be seen in examples (5:1) to (5:4), are morfological:

- (5:1) *Máš mít s sebou mapu, kde je?*  
 should<sub>2SG</sub> have<sub>INF.PFV</sub> with self<sub>INS</sub> map<sub>ACC</sub> where be<sub>3SG</sub>  
 ‘You should have a map with you, where is it?’
- (5:2) \**Smi se zeptat na jednu věc!*  
 may<sub>2SG.IMP</sub> ask<sub>INF.PFV</sub> on one<sub>F.ACC</sub> thing<sub>ACC</sub>
- (5:3) \**Jsem musen uklidit si v pokoji.*  
 be<sub>1SG</sub> must<sub>M.PASS</sub> clean<sub>INF.PFV</sub> myself<sub>DAT</sub> in room<sub>INS</sub>
- (5:4) \**V ten moment jsem dochtěl jít ze školy.*  
 in that<sub>M.ACC</sub> moment<sub>ACC</sub> be<sub>1SG</sub> want<sub>M.PFV.PST</sub> go<sub>INF.IPFV</sub>  
 from school<sub>GEN</sub>

As we can see in the example (5:1), similarly to Spanish modals, the Czech modals also have the verbal morphology. However, there are again forms which cannot be formed by modal auxiliaries. The example (5:2) shows that the imperative mood belongs among them. Other forms which cannot be made from any ‘true modal verb’ are passive participles (5:3) and perfective forms (5:4).

As for syntax, we can see the last criterion in the examples (5:5) and (5:6):

- (5:5) *Ten domácí úkol hodlám udělat dneska.*  
 that<sub>M.ACC</sub> home<sub>ACC</sub> task<sub>ACC</sub> intend<sub>1SG</sub> do<sub>INF.PFV</sub>  
 today  
 ‘I intend to do the homework today.’
- (5:6) \**Hodlám, abych udělal dneska ten domácí úkol.*  
 intend<sub>1SG</sub> so that<sub>1SG</sub> do<sub>M.PFV.PST</sub> today that<sub>M.ACC</sub>  
 home<sub>ACC</sub> task<sub>ACC</sub>

These examples show that the modal auxiliaries can only be complemented by a full verb in the form of infinitive, and not by a subordinate clause like most other means to express modality. This is because it is an auxiliary verb and it requires an infinitival complement. This is a universal feature of modal auxiliaries.

As we already mentioned, Czech modals have only some morphologic forms and have to be complemented by an infinitive, like the English ones. However, otherwise there are many differences from the English modals, as we can see in examples (5:7) to (5:10):

- (5:7) *Hodlám ten domácí úkol udělat dneska.*  
 intend<sub>1SG</sub> that<sub>M.ACC</sub> home<sub>ACC</sub> task<sub>ACC</sub> do<sub>INF.PFV</sub>  
 today  
 ‘I intend to do the homework today.’

- (5:8) *Kdyby pršelo, ne-šla bych ven s kamarády.*  
 if rain<sub>N,IPFV,PST</sub> not-go<sub>M,IPFV,PST</sub> 1SG.COND outside  
 with friend<sub>PL,INS</sub>  
 ‘If it rained, I would not go outside with friends.’ (spoken by a female)
- (5:9) *Ne-byl to problém, uměl jsem hrát fotbal.*  
 not-be<sub>M,PST</sub> that<sub>N</sub> problem<sub>NOM</sub> can<sub>M,PST</sub> be<sub>1SG</sub> play<sub>INF,IPFV</sub>  
 football<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘That wasn’t a problem, I was able to play football.’ (spoken by a male)
- (5:10) *Mohla bych se jenom na něco zeptat?*  
 can<sub>F,PST</sub> COND.1SG REFL.ACC only on something<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ask<sub>INF,PFV</sub>  
 ‘Could I just ask you something?’ (spoken by a female)

As is clear from (5:7), the modal auxiliary does not have the fixed position between the subject and the full verb which it had in the previous two languages; it can change places with the other constituents of the sentence. This is because Czech, which distinguishes subject and objects by morphology, does not have the word order as strict as the previous two languages. Similarly, a modal verb does not have to be positioned at the apodosis, as the example (5:8) shows; this position is filled with conditional mood, because the apodosis is conditioned by the first part of the sentence. The example (5:9) shows that a past form of a modal signals time rather than modal remoteness, and finally, (5:10) proves that unlike in English, Czech modals can be in the conditional.

They are not distinguished by the NICE properties, either. Let us examine the examples (5:11) to (5:13):

- (5:11) *Ne-chci kupovat žádné vysavače, běžte pryč!*  
 not-want<sub>1SG</sub> buy<sub>INF,IPFV</sub> NOM.PL vacuum cleaner<sub>PL</sub> run<sub>IMP,2PL</sub>  
 away  
 ‘I don’t want to buy a vacuum cleaner, go away!’
- (5:12) *Cítíš, že se něco pálí? Ne, ne-cítím.*  
 smell<sub>2SG</sub> that REFL.ACC something burn<sub>3SG</sub> No  
 not-smell<sub>1SG</sub>  
 ‘Do you smell something burning? No, I don’t.’
- (5:13) *Ty MÁŠ na výběr!*  
 You have<sub>2SG</sub> to choice<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘You do have a choice!’

As the example (5:11) shows, the negation of modal auxiliaries in Czech is not done by a negative particle, but by a negative prefix. As a matter of fact, this is true for regular verbs as well and the negation does not serve to distinguish the two groups. The code appears for the Czech verbs, but as the example (5:12) demonstrates, it appears for the regular verbs as well and therefore it cannot distinguish the two groups either. Inversion would not change the meaning, due to the lax word order in Czech, and as we can see from the example (5:13), emphasis can be expressed in Czech by emphasizing any verb, not only an auxiliary.

## 5.3 MUSET

### 5.3.1 Semantics

Now that the rules are established, we will look at the modal auxiliaries in turn and consider their properties and modal meanings. According to Dušková (2003), the modal meanings may be either dispositional or certitudinal (185). Dispositional modality expresses the disposition of the agent towards realization of the predicate and corresponds to root modality, and certitudinal expresses the level of certitude of the speaker towards the truth value of the sentence and corresponds to epistemic modality.

The first modal verb is *muset*. This modal is connected with both dispositional and certitudinal modality, because it can mean either epistemic necessity (5:14), root necessity (5:15), obligation (5:16), will (5:17) or convenience (5:18). These meanings are in examples (5:14) to (5:18):

- (5:14) *Štěpán už určitě musí být doma.*  
 Štěpán<sub>NOM</sub> already certainly must<sub>3SG</sub> be<sub>INF</sub> at home  
 ‘Štěpán certainly must be at home by now.’
- (5:15) *Ta auta se ne-můžou vyhnout, musí do sebe narazit!*  
 that<sub>N.PL</sub> car<sub>PL.NOM</sub> RECP.ACC not-can<sub>3PL</sub> avoid<sub>INF.PFV</sub>  
 must<sub>3PL</sub> to each other<sub>GEN</sub> crash<sub>INF.PFV</sub>  
 ‘Those cars cannot avoid each other, they must crash!’
- (5:16) *Všichni zaměstnanci musí nosit ochranné brýle.*  
 all<sub>M.NOM</sub> employee<sub>PL.NOM</sub> must<sub>3PL</sub> wear<sub>INF.IPFV</sub>  
 protective<sub>F.PL.ACC</sub> glasses<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘All employees must wear protective glasses.’

- (5:17) *Chelsea musí vyhrát, vsadil jsem na ni tisíc euro.*  
 Chelsea must<sub>3SG</sub> win<sub>INF.PFV</sub> bet<sub>M.PFV.PST</sub> be<sub>1SG</sub> on she<sub>ACC</sub> thousand<sub>ACC</sub> euro<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘Chelsea must win, I have bet thousand euro on them.’
- (5:18) *Musíte dodržovat zákony, jinak půjdete do vězení.*  
 must<sub>2PL</sub> follow<sub>INF.IPFV</sub> law<sub>PL.ACC</sub> otherwise go<sub>2PL.IPFV.FUT</sub> to jail<sub>GEN</sub>  
 ‘You have to follow the laws, otherwise you will go to jail.’ (spoken to a group)

The sentence number (5:14) judges the truth value of claim ‘Štěpán is home’ and therefore is an example of epistemic necessity, (5:15) is root necessity because the necessity is enforced due to circumstances, (5:16) is obligation, because the employees are obligated to do so by their employer, and the example (5:17) is will, because the speaker asserts what they want to happen. The last one, (5:18), is an example of convenience – following the laws is a convenient action, because the speaker and the hearer presumably do not want to go to jail.

### 5.3.2 Morphosyntax

The morphology and syntax of *muset* and *nemuset* are very regular. The only thing worth mentioning is that they do not allow the change into a noun:

- (5:19) *\*Tohle ne-ní otázka musení, můžeš si vybrat.*  
 this<sub>N.NOM</sub> not-be<sub>3SG</sub> question<sub>NOM</sub> must<sub>GEN</sub> can<sub>2SG</sub> REFL.DAT choose<sub>INF.PFV</sub>

## 5.4 MOCI

### 5.4.1 Semantics

The second modal auxiliary is *moci*. *Moci* is connected to both of the main types of modality established by Dušková, and it has five possible meanings: epistemic possibility (5:20), root possibility (5:21), permission (5:22), ability (5:23) and suggestion (5:24). Look at examples (5:20) to (5:24):

- (5:20) *Petr může mít nekalé úmysly, ale ne-vím to jistě.*  
 Petr<sub>NOM</sub> can<sub>3SG</sub> have<sub>INF.IPFV</sub> dishonest<sub>M.PL.ACC</sub> intention<sub>PL.ACC</sub>  
 but not-know<sub>1SG.IPFV</sub> that<sub>N.ACC</sub> certainly  
 ‘Petr may have dishonest intentions, but I do not know for sure.’

- (5:21) *Pozor s tím nožem, mohl*  
*bys někoho zranit!*  
 attention<sub>NOM</sub> with that<sub>M.INS</sub> knife<sub>INS</sub> can<sub>M.PST</sub>  
 2SG.COND someone<sub>ACC</sub> injure<sub>INF.PFV</sub>  
 ‘Pay attention to the knife, you could hurt someone!’ (spoken to a male)
- (5:22) *Můžeš vstoupit!*  
 can<sub>2SG</sub> enter<sub>INF.PFV</sub>  
 ‘You may enter!’
- (5:23) *Gepard může běžet rychlostí až devadesát*  
*kilometrů za hodinu.*  
 cheetah<sub>NOM</sub> can<sub>3SG</sub> run<sub>INF.IPFV</sub> speed<sub>INS</sub> up to ninety  
 kilometre<sub>PL</sub> in hour<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘A cheetah can run up to ninety kilometres per hour.’
- (5:24) *Ne-víš, co dělat? Můžeš umýt nádobí.*  
 not-know<sub>2SG</sub> what do<sub>INF.IPFV</sub> can<sub>2SG</sub> wash<sub>INF.PFV</sub> dishware  
 ‘You don’t know what to do? You can wash the dishes.’

The example (5:20) is epistemic possibility, because it judges the truth value, (5:21) is root possibility, because the possibility is enabled by circumstances (namely, the holder of the knife not paying attention while other people are present), (5:22) is an example of permission, the example (5:23) shows ability, because it judges whether the cheetah is capable of such feats or not, and (5:24) gives a suggestion which the hearer might or might not heed.

#### 5.4.2 Morphosyntax

This modal verb does have some peculiarities, which we can see in the following examples:

- (5:25) *Mohla jsem běžet rychleji než Eva,*  
*protože mám delší nohy.*  
 can<sub>F.PST</sub> be<sub>1SG</sub> run<sub>INF.IPFV</sub> fast<sub>COMP</sub> than Evan<sub>NOM</sub>  
 because have<sub>1SG.IPFV</sub> long<sub>F.PL.COMP</sub> leg<sub>PL</sub>  
 ‘I could run faster than Eva because I have longer legs.’ (spoken by a female)
- (5:26) *Zvládla jsem běžet jenom deset metrů,*  
*protože pak jsem zakopla.*  
 manage<sub>F.PFV.PST</sub> be<sub>1SG</sub> run<sub>INF.IPFV</sub> only ten<sub>ACC</sub> meter<sub>PL.ACC</sub>  
 because then be<sub>1SG</sub> trip<sub>F.PFV.PST</sub>  
 ‘I managed to run only ten meters, because after that I tripped.’ (spoken by a female)
- (5:27) *Císař Svaté říše římské měl*  
*velkou moc.*  
 emperor<sub>NOM</sub> holy<sub>F.GEN</sub> empire<sub>GEN</sub> roman<sub>F.GEN</sub> have<sub>M.PFV.PST</sub>  
 big<sub>F.ACC</sub> might<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘The emperor of Holy Roman Empire was very mighty.’

As we can see from examples (5:25) and (5:26), although *moci* can be used for expressing ability in the past, when it comes to achieving something with the help of that ability, it has to be expressed by another verb. And (5:27) shows that unlike *muset*, *moci* has a verbal noun. However, it should be noted that while the noun *moc* still has a connection to the original verb (it is, essentially, ability to cause things), it is noticeably different and it does not denote simply the process of the verb, which means this case is slightly unclear.

## 5.5 MÍT

### 5.5.1 Semantics

The third verb is *mít*. Similarly to *muset*, it is a verb of necessity, but the meanings are different. *Mít* might mean epistemic possibility (5:28), obligation (5:29), convenience (5:30) or expectation (5:31):

(5:28) *V tuto dobu by Jana měla být ve škole.*  
 in this<sub>F.ACC</sub> period<sub>ACC</sub> 3SG.COND Jana<sub>NOM</sub>  
 should<sub>F.PST</sub> be<sub>INF</sub> in school<sub>LOC</sub>  
 ‘Jana should be at school at this time.’

(5:29) *Do pondělí mám odevzdat dvě eseje.*  
 by Monday<sub>GEN</sub> should<sub>1SG</sub> submit<sub>INF.PFV</sub> two<sub>F.ACC</sub>  
 essay<sub>PL.ACC</sub>  
 ‘I have to submit two essays by Monday.’

(5:30) *Ženich má v den svatby vidět nevěstu až při obřadu.*  
 groom<sub>NOM</sub> should<sub>3SG</sub> in day<sub>ACC</sub> marriage<sub>GEN</sub>  
 see<sub>INF.PFV</sub> bride<sub>ACC</sub> when during ceremony<sub>GEN</sub>  
 ‘At the day of their marriage, the groom should not see the bride until during the ceremony.’

(5:31) *Učitelka má jet o prázdninách do Trinidadu a Tobagu.*  
 teacher<sub>F.NOM</sub> should<sub>3SG</sub> go<sub>INF.IPFV</sub> about vacation<sub>PL.LOC</sub> to  
 Trinidad<sub>GEN</sub> and Tobago<sub>GEN</sub>  
 ‘The teacher plans to go to Trinidad and Tobago on vacation.’

The example (5:28) is an example of epistemic necessity, because the speaker judges the truth value of the claim ‘Jana is at school’, and although the likelihood of the claim being truthful is higher than with *moci*, there are still other possible cases and therefore it is only a possibility. The example (5:29) is an obligation, because the speaker is obligated to do so (most likely by a teacher), (5:30) is a

convenience, because it describes a tradition which is merely convenient to follow, and (5:31) is expectation, because the teacher is expected to do so.

### 5.5.2 Morphosyntax

The verb *mít* also has some interesting points to address, which we will see in the examples (5:32) to (5:34):

- (5:32) ??*Muset*    *jsem to udělat, ale ne-udělal*  
*jsem to.*  
 must<sub>M.PST</sub> be<sub>1SG</sub> that<sub>N.ACC</sub> do<sub>INF.PFV</sub> but not-do<sub>M.PFV.PST</sub>  
 be<sub>1SG</sub> that<sub>N.ACC</sub>  
 ‘I had to do it, but I didn’t do it.’ (spoken by a male, attempted)
- (5:33) *Měl jsem to udělat, ale ne-udělal*  
*jsem to.*  
 should<sub>M.PST</sub> be<sub>1SG</sub> that<sub>N.ACC</sub> do<sub>INF.PFV</sub> but not-do<sub>M.PFV.PST</sub>  
 be<sub>1SG</sub> that<sub>N.ACC</sub>  
 ‘I should have done it, but I didn’t do it.’ (spoken by a male)
- (5:34) *‘Do zítřka máš udělat...’ \*‘Ale, přestaň*  
*s tím měním!’*  
 by tomorrow<sub>GEN</sub> should<sub>2SG</sub> do<sub>INF.PFV</sub> but stop<sub>2SG.IMP</sub>  
 with that<sub>N.INS</sub> should<sub>INS</sub>

As we can see, although the verb *mít* expresses necessity like *muset*, they differ very much in the past tense, because *muset* expresses fulfilled necessity (and therefore it is incompatible with the second part of the sentence in the example (5:32), which says that the necessity was unfulfilled), while *mít* can express both fulfilled and unfulfilled necessity (which means that the sentence in the example (5:33) is working perfectly). Also, as (5:34) demonstrates, *mít* cannot be transformed into a noun, just like *muset*.

## 5.6 SMĚT

### 5.6.1 Semantics

The fourth modal verb in Czech is *smět*. Unlike the previous three modal verbs, this one is connected only with dispositional modality, because it has only one meaning and that is permission (5:35). Let us look at the example:

- (5:35) *Trenér každého týmu smí jednou za*  
*zápas požádat o oddechový čas.*  
 coach<sub>M.NOM</sub> each<sub>M.GEN</sub> team<sub>GEN</sub> may<sub>3SG</sub> once for  
 match<sub>ACC</sub> ask<sub>INF.PFV</sub> about relaxing<sub>M.ACC</sub> time<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘Once in the match, the coaches of each team may ask for a timeout.’

As we can see, the sentence (5:35) is an example of permission, because it clarifies that the coaches are permitted to do so by the rules. Since *smět* is the Czech equivalent of ‘be allowed to’, it has permission in its definition and is therefore not used to indicate any other modal meaning.

### 5.6.2 Morphosyntax

Similarly to *muset*, *smět* has only one peculiarity, and the peculiarity is demonstrated in the example number (5:36):

(5:36)	<i>*Ne-zabývej</i>	<i>se</i>	<i>směním</i>	<i>a</i>	<i>udělej</i>
	<i>to, než si</i>	<i>toho</i>	<i>někdo</i>		<i>všimne!</i>
	not-occupy <sub>2SG.IMP</sub>	REFL.ACC	may <sub>INS</sub>	and	do <sub>2SG.IMP</sub>
	that <sub>N</sub> before	REFL.DAT	that <sub>N.GEN</sub>	someone <sub>NOM</sub>	notice <sub>3SG.PFV.FUT</sub>

It is clear from the example that similarly to both *mít* and *muset*, *smět* is unable to be turned into a noun form.

## 5.7 CHTÍT

### 5.7.1 Semantics

The next modal auxiliary in Czech is *chtít*. Although this auxiliary is also connected only with dispositional modality, its number of meanings is not so restricted, since it has three possible examples: volition (5:37), root necessity (5:38) and convenience (5:39). This is demonstrated by the examples (5:37) to (5:39):

(5:37)	<i>Chci</i>	<i>tu</i>	<i>soutěž</i>	<i>vyhrát</i>	<i>víc,</i>
	<i>než si</i>	<i>myslíš!</i>			
	want <sub>1SG</sub>	that <sub>F.ACC</sub>	competition <sub>ACC</sub>	win <sub>INF.PFV</sub>	more
	than	REFL.DAT	think <sub>2SG</sub>		
	‘I want to win the competition more than you think!’				

(5:38)	<i>Ty</i>	<i>dveře</i>	<i>chtějí</i>	<i>už</i>	<i>naléhavě</i>
	<i>opravit.</i>				
	that <sub>F.PL</sub>	door <sub>NOM</sub>	need <sub>3PL</sub>	already	urgently
	repair <sub>INF.PFV</sub>				
	‘The door now urgently needs to be repaired.’				

(5:39)	<i>Chce</i>	<i>to</i>	<i>utáhnout</i>	<i>tenhle</i>	<i>šroubek,</i>
	<i>jinak</i>	<i>by</i>	<i>mohla</i>	<i>začít</i>	<i>unikat</i>
	<i>voda</i>				
	want <sub>3SG</sub>	that <sub>N</sub>	tighten <sub>INF.PFV</sub>	this <sub>M.ACC</sub>	bolt <sub>ACC</sub>
	otherwise	3SG.COND	can <sub>F.IPFV.PST</sub>	start <sub>INF</sub>	leak <sub>INF.IPFV</sub>
	water <sub>NOM</sub>				
	‘This bolt needs to be fastened, or else the water might start leaking.’				

As we can see, in (5:37) *chtít* expresses an volition of the speaker. This is the main meaning of this verb, but it also has two additional ones. (5:38) is an example of

one of them – it expresses an urgent need, which is a part of root necessity since it is enforced by the circumstances. And the final meaning, the one in (5:39), is of convenience, because the action is not as pressing, merely convenient.

### 5.7.2 Morphosyntax

There are two important things to note about *chtít*:

- (5:40) *Radek chce, abys mu vrátil ten časopis.*  
 Radek<sub>NOM</sub> want<sub>3SG</sub> so that<sub>2SG</sub> he<sub>DAT</sub> return<sub>M.PFV.PST</sub>  
 that<sub>M.ACC</sub> magazine<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘Radek wants you to return the magazine.’ (spoken to a male)
- (5:41) *Chtění je synonymum pro vůli.*  
 want<sub>NOM</sub> be<sub>3SG</sub> synonym<sub>NOM</sub> for will<sub>ACC</sub>  
 ‘The want is a synonym of will.’

The example (5:40) demonstrates that unlike the other modal verbs, *chtít* is not connected only to infinitives. In the sentence like this one, it means wish, which is still a modal meaning, yet it is complemented by a subordinate clause. And (5:41) reveals another difference – unlike most previously mentioned modal verbs, it allows for the transformation into a noun.

## 5.8 HODLAT

### 5.8.1 Semantics

The penultimate modal verb in Czech is *hodlat*. This modal verb is also connected only to dispositional modality, as it has only one meaning: volition (5:42). This is clear from the example (5:42):

- (5:42) *Hodlám těm vraždám učinit přítrž!*  
 intend<sub>1SG</sub> that<sub>F.PL.DAT</sub> murder<sub>PL.DAT</sub> render<sub>INF.PFV</sub> stop  
 ‘I intend to cause the murders to stop!’

The sentence (5:42) clearly expresses what the speaker intends to do, which proves that it is an example of volition.

### 5.8.2 Morphosyntax

Once again, *hodlat* has mainly one noteworthy thing, which is demonstrated in the next example:

- (5:43) *\*Pavel to určitě udělá, má v sobě hodně hodlání.*  
 Pavel<sub>NOM</sub> that<sub>N.ACC</sub> certainly do<sub>3SG.PFV.FUT</sub> have<sub>3SG.IPFV</sub>  
 in himself<sub>LOC</sub> many intend<sub>ACC</sub>

As we can see in (5:43), similarly to most other Czech modals, *hodlat* cannot be made into a noun.

## 5.9 UMĚT

### 5.9.1 Semantics

And the last modal verb in Czech is *umět*. Once again, it has only one dispositional meaning, and the meaning is ability (5:44). See for yourself:

(5:44) *Umíš hrát dobře poker?*  
can<sub>2SG</sub> play<sub>INF.IPFV</sub> good poker<sub>ACC</sub>  
'Can you play poker well?'

As a question about how good is the hearer in playing a game, the sentence (5:44) is a clear example of ability.

### 5.9.2 Morphosyntax

Similarly to *chtít*, *umět* is different from most modal verbs by the fact that it does have a verbal noun:

(5:45) *Dát míči takovou rotaci je docela umění.*  
give<sub>INF.PFV</sub> ball<sub>DAT</sub> such<sub>F.ACC</sub> rotation<sub>ACC</sub> be<sub>3SG</sub> quite  
ability<sub>NOM</sub>  
'To give the ball such a rotation is quite an ability.'

Even though the noun is more often used with its secondary meaning 'art', the sentence (5:45) shows that it can also be used with the meaning 'a great ability', directly resulting from the original verb meaning.

## 5.10 THE COMPARISON WITH REGULAR VERBS

	semantics	morphology	complements	position in a sentence	NICE criteria
regular verbs	unlimited set of meanings denoting generally actions	person, number, three moods (indicative, conditional and imperative), tense, infinitive, voice, participles, perfective and imperfective forms, can be turned into verbal nouns	unlimited	varies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not negated by a negative particle</li> <li>- inversion does not change meaning</li> <li>- represents the rest of the sentence in short answers</li> <li>- can be emphasised</li> </ul>
modal verbs	limited set of meanings denoting possibility, necessity, permission, obligation, ability, suggestion, volition, convenience and expectation	person, number, two moods (indicative and conditional), tense, infinitive, only active voice, participles, only imperfective forms, can be turned into verbal nouns (only for <i>chtít</i> , <i>umět</i> and arguably <i>moci</i> )	only infinitive and subordinate clause (only for <i>chtít</i> )	varies, not at the beginning of apodosis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- not negated by a negative particle</li> <li>- inversion does not change meaning</li> <li>- represents the rest of the sentence in short answers</li> <li>- can be emphasised</li> </ul>

**Table 3:** The comparison of modal verbs with regular verbs in Czech

## 6 THE COMPARISON

### 6.1 SEMANTICS

There is not much to compare in the modal semantic of the three languages, since the basic modal meanings are the same. They may be called differently, but whether it is called epistemic (English + Spanish), propositional (Spanish) or certitudinal (Czech), one of them always expresses a judgement of the level of the truth value in the claim expressed by the predicate. Similarly, the one which generally accompanies it may be called root (English), radical (Spanish) or even dispositional (Czech), but it always expresses the attitude of the speaker or other people towards the realization of the predicate. These basic modal meanings are also divided into the same specific modal meanings – namely epistemic possibility and necessity, root possibility and necessity, permission, obligation, ability and suggestion; English and Czech add also volition and Czech adds convenience with expectation. The one thing which changes, however, is the distribution of specific modal meanings among the modal auxiliaries in the language.

In English, the specific modal meanings are more or less evenly spread among the nine modals. Four modals are primarily connected with possibility (*can, may, could, might*), three with necessity (*will, should, must*) and two are unclear (*shall, would*). The number of meanings per auxiliary is also roughly equal – neither has more than four meanings, and only *might* and *would* have just two. This is most likely the result of the fact that in English, modal auxiliaries are the main way to express modality, and therefore they all had to develop enough to cover all the meanings adequately.

In Spanish, the situation is quite the opposite. There are only six modal verbs, and five of them are connected with necessity, only *poder* ‘can’ expressing the meanings of possibility. Not surprisingly, *poder* also covers the most meanings – five, while two modal verbs (*deber de* ‘must’ and *haber que* ‘have to’) have only one meaning. This is also not surprising, since the modality in Spanish is also largely covered by the subjunctive mood, which expresses the uncertain and unreal and therefore tends to represent the possibility more often than necessity. And since

there are so many modal verbs expressing necessity, some of them inevitably express only a particular nuance of meaning.

In Czech, the situation is different yet again. The seven modals are evenly spread – two of them express necessity (*muset* ‘must’, *mít* ‘should’), three of them possibility (*moci* ‘can’, *smět* ‘may’, *umět* ‘can’) and two intention (*chtít* – ‘want’, *hodlat* – ‘intend’). On the other hand, the specific meanings are not – *smět*, *hodlat* and *umět* have only one meaning, the rest of the verbs have three to five meanings. This is probably because in Czech, all the modal meanings can also be expressed by many other lexical means. Since the other means cover all the modal meanings equally, it does not create the disparity which is in Spanish, but it means that only the most common modals cover more meaning, because with all the other means the modal verbs do not have to express as much.

## 6.2 MORPHOLOGY

The situation is quite different when it comes to morphology. Unlike semantics, which are more or less similar, the morphology of modal auxiliaries is very different across the three languages.

The morphology of English modals is without a doubt the most restricted one out of the three. The modal verbs are allowed to have only select few forms, and as the very first examples in the work, (3:1) to (3:6), showed, there are no non-finite forms among them. The only forms which are allowed for modal auxiliaries in English are the bare infinitive (which is the default form of modal auxiliaries in this language), the preterite form, the negative form, the preterite negative form, the shortened form and the shortened negative form.

And what is more, all the modal auxiliaries do not have all of these forms. Only two forms are present for all of the modal verbs, the base form and the shortened negative form. The other forms are available only for certain verbs.

Firstly, it is a specialty of English, which does not happen in Spanish or Czech, that the preterite forms of modal verbs generally express modal remoteness and not time remoteness. When this happens, the preterite forms are modal verbs in their own right; otherwise, they still function as the preterite forms of the original auxiliary. This means that most of the original modal verbs (*can*, *may*, *will* and

*shall*) have also the preterite forms and their corresponding shortened negative forms, but the rest of them does not. *Must* is simply an exception, and the modals which were originally a preterite (*could, might, would* and *should*) cannot have a preterite on the account of being originally a preterite themselves.

The contracted form is there also for four of the modals. *Will* and *shall* share the contracted form ‘*ll*’, while *would* and *should* share the contracted form ‘*d*’. Since both contracted forms are shared by two modal auxiliaries, the actual meaning of the contracted form has to be understood from the context. And finally, *can* is the only modal auxiliary to also have a non-contracted negative form, *cannot*. All of the other modal verbs express uncontracted negation by putting the particle *not* after the auxiliary, as we can see in the examples (6:1)a to (6:1)h:

- (6:1)
- a. We may not talk about the weather.
  - b. We will not talk about the weather.
  - c. We shall not talk about the weather.
  - d. We could not talk about the weather.
  - e. We might not talk about the weather.
  - f. We would not talk about the weather.
  - g. We should not talk about the weather.
  - h. We must not talk about the weather.

Spanish is a completely different case. Unlike English, it allows its modal auxiliaries to retain almost all of the morphology available for normal verbs, the only exception being the passive form. Of course, when it comes to verbs, Spanish morphology is far broader than English, which means most of the Spanish morphology does not exist in English in the first place. However, there is still some morphology which exists in both languages and Spanish modal verbs have it, while the English ones do not. Let us look at it in the example (6:2):

- (6:2) *Oscar,            teniendo que proteger       Carlo, fue            noc*  
*él    a        la                    selva.*  
 Oscar        have TOGER   protectINF   Carlo   go3SG.PST   with  
 he   to       the<sub>F.SG</sub> jungle  
 ‘Having to protect Carlo, Oscar went with him to the jungle.’

As we can see, an example of such morphology is the gerund. It cannot be in English modals, as was shown all the way back in the example (3:4), but the example (6:2) shows that it is perfectly compatible with Spanish modals.

That being said, this can also go the other way around. Three of the forms of English modal verbs, contracted form, negative form and contracted negative form, are not present for Spanish modal verbs. However, this is only because these forms do not exist in Spanish at all. Spanish does not contract verbs or particles at all, and the negation is done by combining the verb with negative particle *no*, similarly to most English verbs.

Czech is, once again, a different tale altogether. Similarly to semantics, it presents a middle ground between the two extremes shown in English and Spanish. It does not have the morphology of modal verbs as restricted as English, in which the morphology is even deepened by its low level of morphology in general, but the modal auxiliaries do not have the almost complete morphology like the Spanish ones do. Czech modal verbs cannot be combined with certain morphology, namely the imperative form, the passive form and the perfective form. Also, most of the Czech modal auxiliaries do not have a verbal noun.

When compared with the two previous languages, the morphology of modals in Czech is much closer to the situation of Spanish than to the situation in English, as it is very rich and developed, almost as rich and developed as the morphology of Spanish nouns. With the passive being absent from modals in both languages and perfective forms not existing in Spanish at all, the difference between Czech and Spanish in this regard is only the missing imperative mood of modal verbs and the missing. In both Czech and Spanish, some modals have verbal noun and some do not. In Spanish, only the one-word modals (*deber* ‘must’ and *poder* ‘can’) have it, in Czech, it is present for *chtít* ‘want’, *umět* ‘can’ and arguably *moci* ‘can’.

In comparison to English, Czech, unlike Spanish, notably not only does not lack the negative form (created by prefix *ne-*), but unlike English has it for all of the modals. However, similarly to Spanish, it still lacks the contracted forms.

### 6.3 SYNTAX

The syntax of the modal verbs is probably the most interesting field to compare out of the three. This is because while semantics and morphology of the modal verbs are in all three languages fairly straightforward and easy to compare, syntax is where it gets complicated. It is no easily countable list of forms or meanings

like the other two. Instead, it is a set of rules which sometimes apply to all contexts and sometimes only to some of them, and what is more, the rules in Spanish even vary across the language and different modals have different rules.

English has several syntactical rules, which apply to all the modals. Firstly, their position in a sentence is between the subject and the full verb, which is its complement, unless inversion takes place, which is mainly in the questions. There is also the rest of the so-called NICE properties, along with inversion, namely the ability to form negation simply by adding the negative particle *not*, the ability to omit the full verb in short responses which depend on the context and they can be inserted into the sentence in order to emphasize it. And there are also two other universal rules: their full verb complements must be in the form of bare infinitive, and the auxiliaries also occur in remote conditional as the first verb of the apodosis.

This is quite a lot of rules, but on the other hand, English is in this aspect internally consistent, since all the full modal verbs have the same syntax. There are several verbs which are not fully modal since they do not follow all of these rules, most notably *dare* and *need*, which can also function as main verbs, and *ought* and *used*, which require a to-infinitive instead of a bare infinitive as their complements; however, the fully modal verbs covered in this work follow the same rules.

On the other hand, the same cannot be said about Spanish, which is once again almost completely different from the situation in the English language. One of the few things which stays the same is the position of the modal verb, which is the same as in English. It also gets inverted in the questions, but unlike English, in Spanish this is not a distinguishing feature, since it works for regular verbs as well. The rest of NICE rules is also missing, since emphasis is expressed by other means, specifically a positive particle *sí*, omission of the infinitive is possible only for certain modals and the negation is in Spanish always signalled only by a negative particle, which means it is not something reserved for modal verbs. Another similar rule is the fact that in Spanish, modal auxiliaries still need an infinitival complement, but a normal infinitive suffices, since Spanish does not have a bare infinitive at all. Also, the remote conditionals in Spanish do not start

the apodosis with a modal, but with conditional tense. There are still some similarities, though - neither language allows the combination of modals with so-called pseudo-clefts, and both negate the modality by placing negation in front of the modal verb and the content of the phrase by placing negation after the modal verb.

In Spanish, however, the syntax also slightly changes between modals. Some of the modals (*deber* 'must', *poder* 'can') allow for the omission of the infinitive, most do not; some of the modals (*deber*, *tener que* 'have to', *haber que* 'have to', *poder*) can be compatible with compound infinitives, while some of the verbs and in some contexts even the aforementioned verbs are not; some of the verbs are incompatible with subordinate phrases, constructions *estar + gerund* or *ir + a*, while others have no such limitation, and some of the modals even have completely special syntactical rules like inability to be used in interrogative contexts (*deber de* 'must').

And the final language is once again the Czech language, where the situation is once again completely different. This time, there is not even the same position of the modal verb, or rather, the same position is not forced, since the word order in Czech is far laxer than in the other two languages. The NICE properties are once again missing, as the less strict word order would make inversion meaningless, negation in all verbs is expressed in Czech by a negative prefix rather than a negative particle, and emphasis can be expressed by emphasizing any verb. The only property which is present in Czech modals is the ability to omit the rest of the sentence in answers; however, this ability is also present for regular verbs.

The other features of the syntax of Czech modal verbs are mostly similar to Spanish. Just like there, the modal verb has to be accompanied by infinitive (but there are no compound infinitives in Czech, only simple) and the apodosis of a remote conditional does not start with a modal, but with conditional mood.

However, unlike in Spanish, the syntax of different modal verbs is the same. In this aspect, Czech is more similar to English.

## 7 REFERENCES

- Aarts, Bas. 2006. *The Handbook of Linguistic Notes*. Blackwell Publishing: Oxford.
- Bosque, Ignacio, and Victoria Demonte. 1999. *Gramática descriptiva de la lengua española*. Espasa: Madrid.
- Bybee, Joan L. 1995. 'The Semantic Development of Past Tense Modals in English'. In *Modality in Grammar and Discourse*, ed. Bybee, Joan L. and Suzanne Fleischman. John Benjamins Publishing Company: Philadelphia.
- Daneš, František, et al. 1987. *Akademická mluvnice češtiny 3 - skladba*. Academia: Praha.
- Davies, Mark. 2008-. *The Corpus of Contemporary American English (COCA): 560 million words, 1990-present*. <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>.
- Davies, Mark. 2018-. *El corpus del Español: NOW (NOW): 5.5 billion words, 2012-present*. <https://www.corpusdelespanol.org/now/>.
- Dušková, Libuše. 2003. *Mluvnice současné angličtiny na pozadí češtiny*. Academia: Praha.
- Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge UP: Cambridge.
- Kořenský, Jan, Miroslav Komárek et al. 1987. *Akademická mluvnice češtiny 2 – tvarosloví*. Academia: Praha.
- Palmer, Frank R. 2001. *Mood and Modality*. Cambridge UP: Cambridge.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, Jan Svartvik. 1985. *A Comprehensive grammar of the English Language*. Longman: New York.
- Real Academia Española. 2010. *Manual de la nueva gramática de la lengua española*. Espasa: Madrid.
- van der Auwera, Johan, and Alfonso Zamorano Aguilar. 2016. 'The History of Modality and Mood'. In *The Oxford Handbook of Modality and Mood*, ed. Nuyts, Jan and Johan van der Auwera. Oxford UP: Oxford.