

Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Some existing proposals	1
1.2	Some basic descriptive problems	3
1.3	The present investigation	6
1.4	Data and the variety question	7
1.5	Methodological issues	8
1.6	Organization	10
2	Periphrastic forms	11
2.1	Introduction: establishing semantic relatedness	11
2.2	The classification of auxiliaries and modals	14
2.3	Criteria for periphrastics	18
2.3.1	Syntactic criteria	18
2.3.1.1	Tests of syntactic behaviour	19
2.3.1.2	Restrictions on the ordering and combination of items	22
2.3.2	Semantic criteria	27
2.3.2.1	Lack of subject–auxiliary restrictions	27
2.3.2.2	Voice neutrality	29
2.3.2.3	Idiomatic status	29
2.3.2.4	Modal meaning	30
2.3.2.5	Epistemic–non-epistemic alternation	30
2.3.2.6	Conclusion	33
2.3.3	Phonological criteria	33
2.4	Conclusion	35
3	Approaches to this area	38
3.1	Introduction	38
3.2	Types of modal meaning and related terminology	40
3.3	Subjectivity and objectivity	44
3.3.1	Introduction	44
3.3.2	Various approaches	46
3.3.2.1	Semantic structure: modal and propositional elements	46
3.3.2.2	Point of view	51
3.3.2.3	Empathy perspective	52
3.3.2.4	The observer and the observed	53
3.3.3	Subjectivity, objectivity and modal–periphrastic alternation	54
3.3.4	Deontic source and deontic target	59
3.3.5	Some relevant descriptions	63

3.4	The generative framework	67
3.4.1	Scope phenomena	70
3.4.2	Restrictions associated with subjectivity	73
3.5	Pragmatic approaches	76
3.5.1	Various approaches to word meaning	77
3.5.2	Pragmatic interpretation	79
3.5.3	Processing constraints	82
3.5.4	Tense, time and modality	84
3.6	The 'actuality hypothesis' and related proposals	85
3.7	Style and variety	88
3.8	Markedness	90
3.9	Conclusion	93
4	Must, have (got) to, need (to) and be bound to	94
4.1	Introduction	94
4.2	Framework of this discussion	95
4.2.1	Some basic problems	95
4.2.2	General approach	97
4.3	Variety and style	99
4.3.1	<i>Must</i> vs <i>have (got) to</i>	99
4.3.2	Epistemic vs deontic uses	102
4.3.3	<i>Have got to</i> as an informal item	102
4.4	Deontic uses of <i>must</i> , <i>have (got) to</i> and <i>need (to)</i> : present tenses, affirmative ..	103
4.4.1	First person subjects	104
4.4.1.1	First person subjects with <i>must</i>	104
4.4.1.2	First person subjects with <i>have to</i>	108
4.4.1.3	First person subjects with <i>have got to</i>	109
4.4.1.4	First person subjects with <i>need (to)</i>	111
4.4.1.5	Conclusion on first person subjects	112
4.4.2	Second person subjects	113
4.4.2.1	Second person subjects with <i>must</i>	113
4.4.2.2	Second person subjects with <i>have to</i>	117
4.4.2.3	Second person subjects with <i>have got to</i>	119
4.4.2.4	Second person subjects with <i>need (to)</i>	120
4.4.2.5	Conclusion on second person subjects	121
4.4.3	Third person subjects	121
4.4.3.1	Third person subjects with <i>must</i>	121
4.4.3.2	Third person subjects with <i>have to</i>	124
4.4.3.3	Third person subjects with <i>have got to</i>	125
4.4.3.4	Third person subjects with <i>need (to)</i>	126
4.4.3.5	Conclusion on third person subjects	126
4.4.4	Conclusion	126

4.5	Other aspects of the deontic uses of <i>must, have (got) to</i> and <i>need (to)</i> ...	127
4.5.1	Future reference	128
4.5.2	Habitual reference	131
4.5.3	Past reference	134
4.5.4	Non-affirmative forms	138
4.5.5	Non-finite forms	141
4.6	Epistemic uses of <i>must, have (got) to</i> and <i>need (to)</i>	142
4.6.1	Present and future reference	143
4.6.2	Past reference	147
4.7	<i>Be bound to</i>	149
4.8	General conclusions	151
4.8.1	General findings	151
4.8.2	Review of proposals in the literature	154
4.8.2.1	Major proposals	154
4.8.2.2	Some individual proposals	156
5	Other modal–periphrastic sets	162
5.1	Introduction	162
5.2	<i>Should, ought to, be supposed to</i> and <i>had better</i>	162
5.2.1	<i>Should</i> and <i>ought to</i>	162
5.2.1.1	General issues	162
5.2.1.2	Comparing the items	164
5.2.2	<i>Be supposed to</i>	175
5.2.2.1	<i>Be supposed to</i> compared with <i>should/ought to</i>	176
5.2.2.2	Specific issues	177
5.2.3	<i>Had better</i>	181
5.2.3.1	<i>Had better</i> compared with <i>should/ought to</i>	181
5.2.3.2	Specific issues	182
5.2.4	Conclusion	185
5.3	<i>Will, be going to, is to</i> and <i>be willing to</i>	185
5.3.1	<i>Will</i> and <i>be going to</i>	186
5.3.1.1	Major analyses and major issues	186
5.3.1.2	Style and formality	189
5.3.1.3	Temporal orientation	192
5.3.1.4	The conditionality or contingency of <i>will</i>	198
5.3.1.5	The objectivity of <i>be going to</i>	200
5.3.1.6	Conclusion	201
5.3.2	<i>Will</i> and <i>is to</i>	202
5.3.3	<i>Will</i> and <i>be willing to</i>	204
5.3.4	Conclusion	205

VIII

5.4	<i>Can</i> and <i>be able to</i>	206
5.4.1	The semantic range of <i>be able to</i>	206
5.4.2	Suppletive uses of <i>be able to</i>	208
5.4.3	<i>Could</i> and actuality	209
5.4.4	Style and formality	212
5.4.5	Conclusion	213
6	Conclusions	214
	Bibliography	220