

Mood has in most cases disappeared. The place of the old Subjunctive Mood was in a number of cases taken up by analytical forms and modal phrases, i.e. combinations of modal verbs with the infinitive. It is this historical process that accounts for the great variety of different forms expressing unreality in modern English.

As some of the forms expressing problematic or unreal actions are modal phrases, it is necessary before describing the different forms of unreality to treat modal verbs first.

§ 74. The speaker's attitude towards the action in the sentence may be expressed in -different ways:

1) By **one of the mood forms** which serve, as has been said, to show whether the action is represented as a real fact or as problematic, or unreal. This form of expression is found in every sentence because it is indispensable to predication.

2) By **modal verbs** which represent an action as necessary or unnecessary, possible or impossible, certain or doubtful and the like. But modal verbs need not be used in every sentence and are, therefore, to be regarded as an additional means of expressing the speaker's attitude towards the action in the sentence.

3) By **attitudinal adverbs** such as *certainly, perhaps, probably, luckily, unfortunately*, etc. (see also "Adverbs", § 2, 8). They express different degrees of certainty on the part of the speaker or the desirability of the action from his point of view.

Modal Verbs

§ 75. We find the following modal verbs in English: **can, may, must, ought, shall, should, will, need and dare**. Besides, **to have** and **to be** in some of their uses are also classed among modal verbs.

A modal verb in combination with the infinitive forms **a modal compound predicate**.

Modal verbs are defective verbs since they lack many forms characteristic of regular verbs: they have no -s in the third person singular in the present tense and no verbals, so they have no analytical forms; some of them lack the form of the past tense.

Modal verbs have the following peculiarities:

1) they are followed by the infinitive **without** the particle *to* (with the exception of *ought, to have* and *to be*);

2) their interrogative and negative forms are built up **without** the auxiliary *do*.

Most of the modal verbs have more than one meaning. Each of their meanings is characterized by a specific usage.

1) Some of the meanings may be found in all kinds of sentences; others occur only in affirmative or interrogative or negative sentences;

2) Different meanings may be associated with different forms of the infinitive — simple and perfect (both in the active and passive forms), continuous and perfect continuous;¹

3) If the modal verbs have more than one form (*can* — *could, may* — *might, will* — *would*, also the verbs *to have* and *to be*), their different meanings are not necessarily found in all those forms.

The use of modal verbs is in most cases independent of the structure of the sentence: the use of this or that modal verb is determined by the attitude of the speaker towards the facts contained in the sentence. In this case we may speak of the **free or independent use of modal verbs**.

e.g. He admires you. He thinks you're a little beauty. Perhaps I **oughtn't to have told** you that. He **may be** in the hall now, waiting for me.

But sometimes the use of certain modal verbs depends on the structure of the sentence, mainly on the type of the subordinate clause, and occasionally also on the lexical character of the predicate verb in the principal clause. This may be called the **structurally dependent use of modal verbs**.

e.g. It is obviously necessary that an investigation **should be made**. Christine feared she **might not be met** at all.

¹ As the difference between the active and the passive forms of the infinitive is of no consequence for the meaning of the modal verb, there is no need to illustrate these forms separately. However, instances where the differentiation between the active and the passive infinitive is important, are dealt with specially.

When the use of modal verbs is structurally dependent, their meaning is sometimes weakened; in fact, it may be quite vague. This may be accounted for by the fact that these verbs become rather part of the structure than bearers of individual meaning.

It is important to take into account one more feature peculiar to modal verbs. They all show that a certain action is represented as necessary, possible, desirable, doubtful, etc. **from the point of view of the speaker.** Consequently, modal verbs are generally used in conversation: In past-time contexts they may be found only in reported speech or thought. Thus *You should have done it before*, or *He might be wrong*, or *It must be true* cannot be possibly found in narration unless they are used after *He thought that...* . *He said that...* . *He knew that...*, etc.

The only exceptions are the past tense forms *could*, *would*, *had*, *was* and *might* which may be used not only in conversation but also in narration.

e.g. Walker was illiterate and **could not sign** his name.

When I looked at her I saw tears in her eyes. So I **had to tell** her the truth.

can

§ 76. The modal verb *can* has the following forms: *can* — the present tense (e.g. *He can speak English*) and **could** — the past tense. The form *could* is used in two ways: a) in past-time contexts as a form of the Indicative Mood (e.g. *He could speak English when he was a child*), b) in present-time contexts to express unreality, or as a milder and more polite form of *can*, or as a form implying more uncertainty than *can* (e.g. *He could speak English if necessary. Could I help you? Could it be true?*) Compare with the Russian *мог бы*: *Он мог бы сделать это, если бы у него было время* (unreality). *He мог бы я вам помочь?* (politeness) *Неужели он мог бы так сказать?* (uncertainty).

§ 77. *Can* has the following meanings: 1) **ability, capability,**

e.g. **I can imagine** how angry he is.

He **can read** a little French.

This meaning may also be expressed by **to be able**. The phrase can be used in all tense-forms if necessary.'

In the meaning of ability and capability *can* occurs in all kinds of sentences.

e.g. She **can play** a few simple tunes on the piano.

Can you write with your left hand? I **cannot (can't) promise** you anything.

In this case *can* is followed by the simple infinitive (see the examples above) and reference is made to the present. But depending on the context it may also refer to the future.

e.g. We can discuss your paper after lunch.

However, if the time reference is not clear from the context or if it is necessary to stress that the action refers to the future, **shall/will be able** is used.

e.g. He **will be able to write** to us from Portugal.

I **shall be able to earn** my own living soon.

The form *could* may be used in past-time contexts and in this case it is followed by a simple infinitive. It is a form of the Indicative Mood here.

e.g. He **could read** a great deal during the holidays.

Could the boy **read** before he went to school?

After what had happened I **couldn't trust** him.

The form *could* may also be used in present-time contexts in combination with the simple infinitive to express unreality with reference to the present or future.

e.g. "I don't want my daughter to be a typist." "Why not? She **could** be secretary to some interesting man." (могла бы быть) You **could articulate** more distinctly with that cigarette out of your mouth, (мог бы говорить более отчетливо)

As the form *could* may be used in two ways (see § 76) it is usually understood as expressing unreality with reference to the present or future unless there are indications of past time in the sentence or in the context. Thus the sentence *She could paint landscapes* will be understood as *Она могла бы. писать пейзажи.*

If there is no indication of past time in the context but the speaker wishes to refer the action to the past, *was/were able* is used instead of *could* to avoid ambiguity.

e.g. She was able to explain the mystery.

In combination with the perfect infinitive *could* indicates that the action was not carried out in the past.

e.g. She could have explained the mystery. Она могла бы объяснить эту тайну, (но не объяснила)

2) possibility due to circumstances,

e.g. You can see the forest through the other window.

We can use either the Present Perfect or the Present Perfect Continuous in this sentence.

In this meaning *can* is found in all kinds of sentences. It is followed by the simple infinitive and it refers the action to the present or future.

e.g. You can obtain a dog from the Dogs' Home at Battersea.

Can we use the indefinite article with this noun? We can't use the indefinite article with this noun.

In past-time contexts the form *could* is used. It is followed by the simple infinitive in this case.

e.g. You could see the forest through the other window before the new block of houses was erected.

The form *could* in combination with the simple infinitive may also express unreality with reference to the present or future.

e.g. You could see the house from here if it were not so dark.

In combination with the perfect infinitive, *could* indicates that the action was not carried out in the past.

e.g. You could have seen the house from there if it had not been so dark.

Note. When *could* is used with reference to the past it denotes only the ability or possibility of performing an action but not the realization of the action. Therefore when a realized or an unrealized action is expressed, *could* is naturally not used. If an action was carried out in the past, it is expressed with the help of *to manage* or *to succeed* (the latter is used in literary style).

e.g. He managed to settle the difficulty.
He succeeded in attaining his aim.

If an action was not realized in the past it is expressed with the help of *to fail*, or *to manage* and *to succeed* in the negative form.

e.g. He failed to reach the peak.
He did not manage to settle the difficulty.

Compare with the Russian: Он мог (был способен) переплыть Волгу в юности. — In his youth he could swim across the Volga.

But: Он смог переплыть Волгу в прошлом году. — He managed to swim across the Volga last year. Also in: Он не мог (ему не удалось) переплыть Волгу в прошлом году. — He failed (didn't manage) to swim across the Volga last year.

As for *to be able*, it may, depending on the lexical character of the infinitive or the context, express either the ability or possibility of performing an action or the realization of that action.

e.g. He was able to speak English well. (Он мог/умел хорошо говорить по-английски.)

He was able to get the book from the library. (Он смог достать книгу в библиотеке.)

3) permission,

e.g. You can take my umbrella.

Can in this meaning is found in affirmative sentences, interrogative sentences in which a request is expressed, and in negative sentences where it expresses prohibition.

Cf. You can use my car. Can I use your car? You can't use my car today.

In this meaning *can* is combined with the simple infinitive. The form *could* with reference to the present is found only in interrogative sentences in which it expresses a more polite request.

e.g. Could I use your car?

The form *could* is found in reported speech (i.e. in accordance with the rules of the sequence of tenses).

e.g. He said that I could use his car.

He asked me if he could use my car.

4) uncertainty, doubt,

e.g. Can it be true?

In this meaning *can* is found only in interrogative sentences (in general questions). Besides, sentences of this kind are often emotionally coloured and so their application is rather restricted.

Depending on the time reference, *can* in this meaning is used in combination with different forms of the infinitive.

Thus, if reference is made to the present, the simple infinitive is found with stative verbs.

e.g. Can he really be ill?
Can it be so late?

With dynamic verbs, the continuous infinitive is used.

e.g. **Can she be telling** lies?

Can he be making the investigation all alone?

Can in combination with the perfect infinitive refers the action to the past.

e.g. **Can he have said it?**

Can she have told a lie?

The combination of *can* with the perfect infinitive may also indicate an action begun in the past and continued into the moment of speaking. This is usually found with stative verbs.

e.g. Can she really **have been** at home all this time?

However, if *can* is followed by a dynamic verb the Perfect Continuous infinitive is used.

e.g. **Can she have been waiting** for us so long?

Could with reference to the present is also used in this way, implying more uncertainty.

e.g. **Could it be true?**

Could she be telling lies?

Could he have said it?

Could she have been waiting for us so long?

In Russian both variants, with *can* and *could*, are rendered in the same way: *Неужели это правда?*, *Неужели она лжет?* and so on.

5) improbability, e.g. It **can't be** true. (Это не может быть правдой. Вряд ли это так.)

In this meaning *can* is found only in negative sentences, which are often emotionally coloured. Depending on the time reference, this *can* is also used with different forms of the infinitive.

e.g. **He can't be** really ill.

She can't be telling lies. * **He can't have said**

it. **She can't have been** at home all this time.

She can't have been waiting for us so long.

Could is also used in this way making the statement less categorical.

e.g. It **couldn't be** true.

She couldn't be telling lies.

He couldn't have said it.

She couldn't have been at home all this time.

She couldn't have been waiting for us so long.

§ 78. *Can* and *could* followed by different forms of the infinitive, are found in special questions where they are used for emotional colouring (for instance, to express puzzlement, impatience, etc.).

e.g. What **can (could) he mean?** What **can (could) he be doing?** What **can (could) he have done?** Where **can (could) he have gone to?**

It can be rendered in Russian as: *Что, собственно, он имеет в виду?*

§ 79. As is seen from the above examples, the form *could* referring to the present is sometimes clearly opposed to *can* in that it expresses unreality whereas *can* expresses reality. This may be observed in the following meanings:

ability — He **can speak** English.

He **could speak** English if necessary.

possibility due to circumstances —

You can get the book from the library.

You could get the book from the library if necessary.

In the other meanings, however, this difference between the two forms is obliterated. *Could* is used either as a milder or more polite form of *can* (a) or as a form implying more uncertainty than *can* (b):

- a) *permission* — Can I use your pen?
 Could I use your pen? (*more polite*)
- b) *uncertainty, doubt, improbability* —
 Can it be true?
 Could it be true? (*less certain*)
 It can't be true.
 It couldn't be true, (*less certain*)

§ 80. In addition to the above cases illustrating the independent use of *can*, this modal verb occurs in adverbial clauses of purpose, where it is structurally dependent (for a detailed treatment of this use of *can* see "Verbs", § 143).

e.g. I'll leave the newspaper on the table so that he can see it at once.
 I left the newspaper on the table so that he could see it at once.

§ 81. Note the following set phrases with *can*:

- a) She can't help crying.
 He couldn't help laughing.
 / *can't help doing* means *не могу удержаться от... от не могу не делать (чего-то)*.
- b) I can't but ask him about it.
 They couldn't but refuse him.
 / *can't but do something* means *(мне) ничего другого не остается, как... .*
- c) He can't possibly do it.
 I couldn't possibly refuse him.
 / *can't (couldn't) possibly do* means *просто не могу (не мог) сделать... .*

may

§ 82. The modal verb *may* has the following forms: *may* — the Present tense (e.g. It may be true) and *might* — the Past tense. The form *might* is used in two ways: a) in past-time contexts, mainly in reported speech in accordance with the rules of the sequence of tenses (e.g. *He told me that it might be true*) and b) in present-time contexts as a milder and more polite form of *may*, or as a form implying more uncertainty than *may* (e.g. *Might I come and see you? It might be true*), or to express unreality (e.g. *He might have fallen ill if he hadn't taken the pills*).

§ 83. *May* has the following meanings: 1) supposition implying uncertainty,

e.g. He may be busy getting ready for his trip.

In Russian this meaning is generally rendered by means of the modal adverbs *возможно* and *может быть*.

In English this meaning may also be rendered by means of the attitudinal adverbs *perhaps* and *maybe*.

In the meaning of supposition implying uncertainty the verb *may* occurs in affirmative and negative sentences.

e.g. He may be at home.

He may not be at home. (Возможно, что его нет дома. Может быть, его нет дома.)

In this meaning *may* can be followed by different forms of the infinitive depending on the time reference expressed.

May in combination with the simple infinitive usually refers the action to the future.

e.g. He may come soon.

The action may also refer to the present but only with stative verbs.

e.g. He may be ill.

He may not know about it.

May in combination with the Continuous infinitive of dynamic verbs refers the action to the present.

e.g. It's too late to phone him now. He **may be sleeping**.
I never see him about now. For all I know, he **may be writing**
a book.

May in combination with the Perfect infinitive refers the action to the past.

e.g. He **may have fallen** ill.
"What's happened to the dog?" I said. "It isn't here. His master **may have taken** it with him."

The combination of *may* with the Perfect infinitive may also indicate an action begun in the past and continued into the moment of speaking. This is usually found with stative verbs.

e.g. He **may have been** at home for about two hours.

However, if *may* is followed by a dynamic verb, the Perfect Continuous infinitive is used.

e.g. He **may have been waiting** for us for an hour.

In the meaning of supposition implying uncertainty, the form *might* is also found. It differs from the form *may* in that it emphasizes the idea of uncertainty. It may be followed by the simple, Continuous or Perfect infinitive.

e.g. He **might come** soon. He
might be ill.
He might be doing his lessons now. He
might have spoken to her yesterday.

2) possibility due to circumstances,

e.g. You **may order** a taxi by telephone.
A useful rough-and-ready rule is that time adverbs **may come**
at either end of the sentence, but not in the middle.

May in this meaning occurs only in affirmative sentences and is followed only by the simple infinitive.

The form *might* is used in past-time contexts in accordance with the rules of the sequence of tenses.

e.g. He said he **might order** a taxi by telephone.

Might followed by the Perfect infinitive indicates that the action was not carried out owing to certain circumstances (expressed in the sentence or implied).

e.g. He **might have fallen** ill if he hadn't taken the medicine.
Luckily he wasn't driving the car. He **might have been hurt**.
You are so careless. You **might have broken** the cup. (Ты чуть
было не разбил чашку.)

3) permission,

e.g. The director is alone now. So you **may see** him now.

May in this meaning is found in affirmative sentences, in interrogative sentences which usually express a request, and in negative sentences where it denotes prohibition. But in negative sentences it is not common as prohibition is generally expressed by other modal verbs (see *can* and *must*).

e.g. You **may smoke** in here.
May I smoke in here? You
may not smoke in here.

In this meaning *may* is combined only with the simple infinitive. In interrogative sentences the form *might* is also found when we wish to express a more polite request.

e.g. Might I join you?

In reported speech the form *might* is used.

e.g. He told me that I **might smoke** in the room.
He asked me if he **might join** us.

4) disapproval or reproach,

e.g. You **might carry** the parcel for me.
You **might have helped** me.

Here we find only the form *might* used in affirmative sentences and followed by the simple or Perfect infinitive. In the latter case it expresses reproach for the non-performance of an action.

§ 84. The form *might* which expresses unreality is not always parallel to *may*.

Might expresses unreality only in combination with the Perfect infinitive.

e.g. You might have let me know about it beforehand.
There was a car accident in front of our house. Luckily Tommy was at school. He might have been killed.

In most cases *might* is used as a milder and more polite form than *may* (a) or as a form implying a greater degree of uncertainty (b):

- a) *permission* — May I speak to him now?
Might I speak to him now? (*very polite*)
b) *supposition* — He may come a little later.
He might come a little later, (*less certain*)

The two forms are not opposed in the meaning of possibility due to circumstances where only *may* is used, nor in the meaning of disapproval or reproach where *might* alone is found.

e.g. You may find the book at the library.

You might have considered your parents' feelings.

§ 85. Notice the following set phrases with *may* and *might*:

a) *May as well (might as well, might just as well) + infinitive* is a very mild and unemphatic way of expressing an intention. It is also used to suggest or recommend an action.

e.g. I may as well take the child with me. (Я, пожалуй, возьму ребенка с собой. Пожалуй, будет лучше, если я возьму ребенка с собой.)

You may as well give him the letter.

I might as well stay at home tonight.

"I'll go at six." "That's far too late; you might just as well not go at all." (Можно было бы и не ходить туда совсем.)

b) *It might have been worse* means 'Things are not so bad after all.' In Russian it is rendered as: *Могло бы быть и хуже* or *В конце концов дела обстоят не так уж плохо*,

c) *He might have been a...* means 'He might have been taken for a...'; 'He looked like a...'

e.g. Roy Wilson, the new doctor, was twenty-eight, large, heavy, mature and blond. He might have been a Scandinavian sailor.

d) *If I may say so...* has become a stereotyped phrase in which the meaning of permission is considerably weakened.

e.g. If I may say so, I think you have treated him very badly.

§ 86. In addition to the above cases illustrating the independent use of *may*, this modal verb occurs in subordinate object clauses after expressions of fear as well as in adverbial clauses of purpose and concession. Here it is structurally dependent (for a detailed treatment of this use of *may* see "Verbs", §§ 135, 143, 152).

e.g. I fear he may fall ill.

He is coming here so that they may discuss it without delay.
However cold it may be, we'll go skiing.

can and may Compared

§ 87. The use of *can* and *may* is parallel only in two meanings: possibility due to circumstances and permission. In these meanings, however, they are not always interchangeable for a number of various reasons.

1) Thus in the meaning of possibility due to circumstances the use of *may* is restricted only to affirmative sentences, whereas *can* is found in all kinds of sentences.

<i>May</i>	<i>Can</i>
He may find this book at the library.	He can find this book at the library.
	Can he find this book at the library?
	He cannot find this book at the library.

Their time reference is also different. *May* refers only to the present or future; the form *might* is used in past-time contexts only in reported speech. *Can (could)* may refer to the present, past or future.

<i>May</i>	<i>Can</i>
He may find the book at the library.	He can find the book at the library.

I said that he might find the book at the library.

He could find the book at the library yesterday.

He can find the book at the library tomorrow.

Both *could* and *might* combined with the Perfect infinitive indicate that the action was not carried out in the past.

e.g. He might have found the book at the library.

He could have found the book at the library.

It follows from the above that the sphere of application of *can* in this meaning is wider than that of *may*.

2) When *may* and *can* express permission the difference between them is rather that of style than of meaning — *may* is more formal than *can* which is characteristic of colloquial English.

Cf. May (might) I speak to you for a moment, professor?

Can (could) I have a cup of tea, Mother?

May in negative sentences expressing prohibition is uncommon.

must

§ 88. The modal verb *must* has only one form. It is used in present-time contexts with reference to the present or future and in combination with the Perfect infinitive it refers to the past. In past-time contexts this form is used only in reported speech, i.e. the rules of the sequence of tenses are not observed with *must*.

§ 89. *Must* has the following meanings:

1) obligation (from the speaker's point of view),

e.g. You must talk to your daughter about her future.

Must he do it himself?

In different contexts *must* may acquire additional shades of meaning, such as duty or necessity.

In this meaning *must* is found in affirmative and interrogative sentences and followed only by the simple infinitive.

2) prohibition,

e.g. He must not leave his room for a while. (Он не должен/ему нельзя выходить из комнаты некоторое время.) This meaning is expressed in negative sentences and *must* is also followed by the simple infinitive.

Note. Absence of necessity (in Russian *не нужно, нет необходимости*) is expressed by other verbs (see *to have* and *need*).

3) emphatic advice,

e.g. You must come and see us when you're in London.

You must stop worrying about your son. You mustn't give another thought to what he said. You mustn't miss the film. It is very good. You must have your hair cut. It's much too long. You mustn't cry.

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

4) supposition implying strong probability,

e.g. He must be ill. He looks so pale.

It must be late as the streets are deserted.

Must in this meaning is found only in affirmative sentences.

In Russian this meaning is generally rendered by means of the attitudinal adverbs *вероятно, должно быть*.

In English this meaning may also be expressed by means of the attitudinal adverb *probably*.

In this meaning *must* may be followed by different forms of the infinitive. If reference is made to the present, the Continuous infinitive is used with dynamic verbs.

e.g. The book is not on the shelf. Jane must be reading it.

Let's have something to eat. You must be starving.

If *must* is followed by the simple infinitive of dynamic verbs, it expresses obligation.

e.g. Jane must read the book.

You must stay here.

However, with stative verbs the simple infinitive is used to express supposition.

e.g. He must be over fifty.

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

Must in combination with the Perfect infinitive refers the action to the past.

e.g. Do you see him smoking over there? He must have finished his work. It is six o'clock. She must have come home.

The combination of *must* with the Perfect Continuous infinitive indicates an action begun in the past and continued into the moment of speaking.

e.g. It must have been raining all the night. There are big puddles in the garden.

However, if *must* is followed by a stative verb, the Perfect infinitive is used.

e.g. He must have been here since breakfast.
He must have known it all along.

Note. Occasionally the combination of *must* with the Perfect Continuous infinitive may express an action going on at a given past moment,

e.g. He must have been writing a letter when I came.

When *must* expresses supposition implying strong probability, its use is restricted in two ways:

a) It is not used with reference to the future. In this case we find attitudinal adverbs in the sentence.

e.g. He will probably come tomorrow.
He will evidently know all about it.

b) It is not used in the interrogative or negative form. It is found only in the affirmative form.

Note. To express supposition implying strong probability with negative meaning, in addition to attitudinal adverbs, the following means are employed:

e.g. He must have failed to get in touch with her.
He must have misunderstood you. He must be unaware of that. He must never have guessed the truth. No one must have told him about it.

§ 90. Note the following set phrases with *must*.

a) *Must needs* denotes obligation.

e.g. He must needs go there. (Он непременно должен пойти туда.)

b) / *must be going* and / *must be off* both mean 'it is time for me to go' (in Russian *Мне пора уходить*).

c) / *must tell you that...* and / *I must say...* are stereotyped phrases in which the meaning of obligation is considerably weakened in *must*.

*d) In the sentences: *You must come and see me some time. You must come and have dinner with me. You must come to our party. You must come and stay with us for the week-end* and the like, the meaning of obligation in *must* is also weakened. *Must* has become part of such sentences which are a common way of expressing invitations.

must and may Compared

§ 91. *Must* and *may* can be compared in two meanings:

1) Both *may* and *must* serve to express supposition but their use is not parallel. *May* denotes supposition implying uncertainty where as the supposition expressed by *must* implies strong probability.

Cf. For all I know, he may be an actor. His face seems so familiar. He must be an actor. His voice carries so well. I saw him an hour ago. He may still be in his office now. He always comes at 10 sharp. So he must be in his office now.

2) *May* and *must* are used to express prohibition in negative sentences. But *may* is seldom found in this meaning. In negative answers to questions with *may* asking for permission we generally find *must not* or *cannot*.

e.g. "May I smoke here?" "No, you mustn't (you can't)."

to have to

§92. *To have to* as a modal verb is not a defective verb and can have all the necessary finite forms as well as the verbals.

e.g. He is an invalid and has to have a nurse. She knew what she had to do. I shall have to reconsider my position. He is always having to exercise judgement. My impression was that he was having to force himself to talk. I have had to remind you of writing to her all this time. The women at Barford had had to be told that an experiment was taking place that day. "As a matter of fact," he said, "I've been having to spend some time with the research people." It wouldn't have been very nice for the Davidsons to have to mix with all those people in the smoking-room. Having to work alone, he wanted all his time for his research.

The interrogative and negative forms of the modal verb *to have to* are built up by means of the auxiliary verb *to do*.¹

e.g. Why do I have to do everything? Did he have to tell them about it? "That's all right," she said. "I just thought I'd ask. You don't have to explain." There was a grin on his face. He did not have to tell me that he already knew.

§ 93. The verb *to have to* serves to express obligation or necessity imposed by circumstances. It is rendered in Russian as *принужден, вынужден*.

In this meaning it is found in all kinds of sentences — affirmative, interrogative and negative — and is combined only with the simple infinitive.

e.g. He had to do it.
Did he have to do it? He did not have to do it.

In negative sentences *to have to* denotes absence of necessity (compare with the negative form of *must* which expresses prohibition).

¹ The interrogative and negative forms of the modal verb *to have to* built up without the auxiliary *do* are uncommon in American English and infrequent in British English.

e.g. You don't have to go there. (Вам не нужно/нет необходимости идти туда.) You mustn't go there. (Вам нельзя идти туда.)

§ 94. In spoken English the meaning of obligation and necessity is also expressed by *have (has) got to*. Like the verb *to have to*, it is found in all kinds of sentences and is combined with the simple infinitive.

e.g. He has got to go right now.
Has he got to go right now?
He hasn't got to go just yet.

This combination may also be found in the past tense, though it is not very common.

e.g. He had got to sell his car.

§ 95. Note the set phrase *had better*.

e.g. A few drops began to fall. "We'd better take shelter," she said. (Нам лучше укрыться.)
She didn't like to say that she thought they had better not play cards when the guest might come in at any moment.

Had better is followed by the infinitive without *to*.

to be to

§ 96. *To be to* as a modal verb is used in the present and past tenses.

e.g. We are to meet at six.
We were to meet at six.

§ 97. *To be to* as a modal verb has the following meanings: 1) a previously arranged plan or obligation resulting from the arrangement,

e.g. We are to discuss it next time.
We were to discuss it the following week.
Is he to arrive tomorrow?
Who was to speak at the meeting?

This meaning of *to be to* is found in affirmative and interrogative sentences in the present and past tenses. *To be to* is followed by the simple infinitive.

The past tense of the verb *to be to* in combination with the Perfect infinitive denotes an unfulfilled plan.

e.g. I promised to go to a club with her last Tuesday, and I really forgot all about it. We were to have played a duet together.

2) orders and instructions, often official (frequently in reported speech),

e.g. I just mention it because you said I was to give you all the details I could.

Norman says I am to leave you alone. All junior officers are to report to the colonel at once.

In this meaning *to be to* is found in affirmative and negative sentences and followed by the simple infinitive.

3) something that is destined to happen,

e.g. He was to be my teacher and friend for many years to come. He did not know at the time that he was never to see his native place again.

It's been a great blow to me that you haven't been able to follow me in my business as I followed my father. Three generations, that would have been. But it wasn't to be.

This meaning of *to be to* is rendered in Russian as *суждено*. It is mainly found in the past tense and its application is limited to narration. It occurs in affirmative and negative sentences and is followed by the simple infinitive.

4) possibility,

e.g. Her father was often to be seen in the bar of the Hotel Metropole.

Where is he to be found? Nothing was to be done under the circumstances.

In this meaning *to be to* is equivalent to *can* or *may*. It is used in all kinds of sentences in the present and past tenses and is followed by the passive infinitive.

§ 98. Note the following set phrases with the modal verb *to be to*:
What am I to do? (Что мне делать? Как мне быть?) What is to become of me? (Что со мной станется? Что со мной будет?)
Where am I to go? (Куда же мне идти? Куда же мне деваться?)

§ 99. *To be to* in the form of *were to + infinitive* for all persons is found in conditional clauses where it is structurally dependent (for a detailed treatment of this use of the verb *to be to* see "Verbs", § 149).

e.g. If he were to come again I should not receive him.

must, to have to and to be to Compared

§ 100. The verbs *must*, *to have to* and *to be to* have one meaning in common, that of obligation. In the present tense the verbs come very close to each other in their use, though they preserve their specific shades of meaning. Thus *must* indicates obligation or necessity from the speaker's viewpoint, i.e. it expresses obligation imposed by the speaker.

e.g. I must do it. (/ *want to do it.*)
He must do it himself. (*I shan't help him.*)

To have to expresses obligation or necessity imposed by circumstances.

e.g. What a pity you have to go now. (*It's time for you to catch your train.*) He has to do it himself. (*He has got no one to help him.*)

To be to expresses obligation or necessity resulting from an arrangement.

e.g. We are to wait for them at the entrance. (*We have arranged to meet there, so we must wait for them at the appointed place.*)

Sometimes the idea of obligation is absent and *to be to* expresses only a previously arranged plan.

e.g. We are to go to the cinema tonight.

Note. In public notices we find *must* because they express obligation imposed by some authorities.

e.g. Passengers *must* cross the railway line by the foot bridge.

The same is true of prohibition expressed in negative sentences.

e.g. Passengers *must not* walk across the railway line.
Visitors *must not* feed the animals.

In the past tense, however, the difference in the use of the three verbs is quite considerable.

Must has no past tense. It is used in past-time contexts only in reported speech.

e.g. He said he *must* do it himself.

Had to + infinitive is generally used to denote an action which was realized in the past as a result of obligation or necessity imposed by circumstances.

e.g. I *had to* sell my car. (*It was necessary for me to do it because I needed money.*)

He *had to* put on his raincoat. (*It was raining hard out side and he would have got wet if he hadn't.*)

Was (were) to + infinitive is used to denote an action planned for the future which is viewed from the past. The action was not realized in the past and the question remains open as to whether it is going to take place.

e.g. We *were to* meet him at the station. (*It is not clear from the sentence if the action will take place.*)

If the speaker wishes to make it clear at once that the plan was not fulfilled, the perfect infinitive is used to show that.

e.g. We *were to have met* him at the station. (*That means that we failed to meet him.*)

However, the simple infinitive may also be used in this case.

§ 101. In reported speech (in past-time contexts) *must* remains unchanged in all of its meanings.

e.g. He said he *must* do it without delay.

He said I *mustn't* tell anyone about it.

The doctor told her that she *must* eat.
They believed the story *must* be true.

Parallel to *must, had to + infinitive* is also used occasionally in reported speech to express obligation.

e.g. He said he *had to* make a telephone call at once.

In this case *had to* is close to *must* in meaning: it does not include the idea of a realized action but refers to some future moment.

**Note.* Care should be taken not to replace *must* by *had to* in reported speech as the two verbs express different meanings (see above).

ought to

§ 102. The modal verb *ought to* has only one form which is used with reference to the present or future. In reported speech it remains unchanged. *Ought* is always followed by the infinitive with *to*.

§ 103. *Ought to* has the following meanings: 1) obligation, which in different contexts may acquire additional shades of meaning, such as advisability and desirability,

e.g. You *ought to* say a word or two about yourself.
Ought she to warn him? He *oughtn't* to mention it to anybody.

In this meaning *ought to* is possible in all kinds of sentences, though it is felt to be awkward in questions where *should* is preferred.

Generally *ought to* refers an action to the future and is followed by the simple infinitive. With reference to the present *ought to* is used with the continuous infinitive or with the simple infinitive if the verb is stative.

e.g. At your age you *ought to* be earning your living.
You *ought to* feel some respect for your elders.

In combination with the perfect infinitive *ought to* in the affirmative form shows that a desirable action was not fulfilled.

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

He ought to have put everything off.

In the negative form *ought to* in combination with the Perfect infinitive shows that an undesirable action was fulfilled.

e.g. I'm sorry. I oughtn't to have said it.

You oughtn't to have married her, David. It was a great mistake.

2) supposition implying strong probability,

e.g. The new sanatorium ought to be very comfortable.

The use of *ought to* in this case is not very common as this meaning is normally rendered by *must*.

Note the set phrases *He/you ought to know it* (=he is/you are supposed to know it). *You ought to be ashamed of yourself*.

shall and *should*

§ 104. Historically, *shall* and *should* were two forms of the same verb expressing obligation.¹ But later they came to express different meanings and in present-day English their use is not parallel — they are treated as two different verbs.

shall

§ 105. In modern English the modal meaning of obligation in *shall* is always combined with the function of an auxiliary verb of the future tense.

Shall is still used to express obligation with the second and third persons, but at present it is not common in this meaning in spoken English. Its use, as a rule, is restricted to formal or even archaic style and is mainly found in subordinate clauses, i.e. it is structurally dependent.

e.g. It has been decided that the proposal shall not be opposed.

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade, be lent, resold, hired put or otherwise disposed of without the publisher's consent.

¹ *Shall* was the present tense of the Indicative Mood; *should* was the Subjunctive Mood.

At present, however, this meaning of obligation, somewhat modified, is found with the second and third persons in sentences expressing promise, threat or warning. It is used in affirmative and negative sentences and combined with the simple infinitive.

e.g. You shall have my answer tomorrow.

"You shall stay just where you are!" his mother cried angrily.

He shall do as I say.

The meaning of obligation may also be traced in interrogative sentences where *shall* is used with the first and third persons to ask after the will of the person addressed. In this case it is also followed by the simple infinitive.

e.g. Shall I get you some fresh coffee, Miss Fleur?

Who shall answer the telephone, Major?

Sentences of this kind are usually rendered in Russian with the help of the infinitive: *Принести вам еще кофе? Кому отвечать по телефону?*, etc.

should

§ 106. In modern English the modal verb *should* is used with reference to the present or future. It remains unchanged in reported speech.

§ 107. *Should* has the following meanings: 1) obligation, which in different contexts may acquire additional shades of meaning, such as advisability and desirability,

e.g. It's late. You should go to bed.

You shouldn't miss the opportunity.

Should I talk to him about it?

Should in this meaning is found in all kinds of sentences. Like *ought to*, it generally refers an action to the future and is followed by the simple infinitive.

With reference to the present *should* is used with the Continuous infinitive or with the simple infinitive if the verb is stative.

e.g. You shouldn't be sitting in the sun. Move out of it into the shade. You shouldn't feel so unhappy over such trifles.

Should may be combined with the Perfect infinitive. In this case the meaning of the combination depends on whether the sentence is affirmative or negative. In an affirmative sentence *should* + *Perfect infinitive* indicates that a desirable action was not carried out.

e.g. He looks very ill. He should have stayed at home. He should have told me about it himself.

In a negative sentence *should* + *Perfect infinitive* serves to show that an undesirable action was carried out.

e.g. Oh, Renny, you shouldn't have done as you did!
They shouldn't have concealed it from us.

2) supposition implying strong probability,

e.g. The film should be very good as it is starring first-class actors.

The use of *should* in this case does not seem to be very common as this meaning is usually rendered by *must*.

§ 108. In addition to the above mentioned cases showing the independent use of *should*, this verb occurs in certain object clauses where it depends on the lexical character of the predicate verb in the principal clause and in adverbial clauses of condition, purpose and concession. Here its use is structurally dependent (for a detailed treatment of this use of the verb see "Verbs", §§ 129, 131, 138, 140, 143, 149).

e.g. I suggest that you should stay here as if nothing had happened.
"It's important," I broke out, "that the Barford people should know what we've just heard."
She was terrified lest they should go on talking about her.
Suddenly she began to cry, burying her head under the book so that I shouldn't see. If he should drop in, give him my message.

§ 109. *Should* may have a peculiar function — it may be used for emotional colouring. In this function it may be called the emotional *should*. The use of the emotional *should* is structurally dependent. It is found in the following cases:

1) In special emphatic constructions, where a simple predicate is not used:

a) in rhetorical questions beginning with *why*,

e.g. Why should I do it? (С какой стати я буду делать это?)
Why shouldn't you invite him? (Почему бы вам его не пригласить?)

b) in object clauses beginning with *why*,

e.g. I don't know why he should want to see George. (Я не знаю, зачем ему нужен Джордж.) I don't see why we shouldn't make friends.

c) in attributive clauses beginning with *why* after the noun *reason*,

e.g. There is no reason why they shouldn't get on very well together. (Нет причины, почему бы им не ладить друг с другом.) I don't see any reason why he shouldn't be happy.

d) in constructions of the following kind,

e.g. The door opened and who should come in but Tom. (Дверь открылась, и кто бы вы думали вошел? Не кто иной, как Том.)

As I was crossing the street, whom should I meet but Aunt Ann.

e) in the set phrase *How should I know?* (Почем я знаю?).

In the above cases *should* may be followed by the Perfect infinitive which in simple sentences refers the action to the past (a) and in complex sentences shows that the action of the subordinate clause precedes that of the principal clause (b).

e.g. a) I went into business with her as her partner. Why shouldn't I have done it? (Почему бы мне было не сделать этого?)

b) He did not know why he should have expected them to look different. (Он не знал, почему он ожидал увидеть их другими.)

There were fifteen equally good reasons why she should not have played bridge.

2) In certain types of subordinate clauses where *should* + *infinitive* is interchangeable with a simple predicate in the Indicative Mood (for the use of the Indicative Mood in these clauses see "Verbs", § 130):

a) in object clauses after expressions of regret, surprise, sometimes pleasure or displeasure,

e.g. I'm sorry that you should think so badly of me. (Мне жаль, что вы так плохо обо мне думаете.) He was little surprised that Ann should speak so frankly about it. I am content that you should think so.

The rules of the sequence of tenses are not observed here. The Perfect infinitive is used to show that the action of the subordinate clause precedes that of the principal clause.

e.g. I am sorry that you should have had a row with Kate about it. He was annoyed that they should have asked him that.

b) in object clauses following the principal clause with it as a formal subject,

e.g. It is absurd that such things should happen to a family like theirs. (Нелепо, чтобы такие вещи случались в такой семье, как их.)

It was strange that he should be asking those questions. It struck him as exceedingly funny that his brother should be in love.

In the principal clause we find such expressions as *it is wonderful* (*absurd, monstrous, natural, odd, queer, singular, strange, terrible* and the like), *it infuriated* (*outraged, puzzled, startled, surprised* and the like) *me, it struck me as funny*, etc. We also find the following interrogative and negative expressions in the principal clause: *is it possible* (*likely, probable*)?, *it is not possible* (*likely, probable*), *it is impossible* (*improbable, unlikely*).¹

As we see from the above examples, the rules of the sequence of tenses are not observed here either.

If the action of the subordinate clause precedes that of the principal clause, the Perfect infinitive is used after *should*.

¹ After the affirmative *it is possible* (*likely, probable*) a simple predicate is used.

e.g. It is inconceivable that Mrs Crosbie should have written such a letter. It's much better that you should have found everything out before it's too late. It infuriated her that he should have spoken to her in such a tone.

Note. *Should* + *infinitive* may be occasionally found instead of a simple predicate in some other kinds of subordinate clauses, but it is not in common use:

a) in predicative clauses,

e.g. *f he part that interests me is that such a thing should happen to such people.

b) in appositive clauses,

e.g. The fact that he should have made such a brilliant speech surprised me greatly.

c) in constructions of the following kind,

e.g. That it should come to this! (И до чего дошло дело!)
To think that it should come to this! (Только подумать, до чего дошло дело!)
To think that it should have happened to me! (Только подумать, что это произошло со мной!)

To sum it up, it should be said that as compared to the use of a simple predicate in the Indicative Mood, the use of *should* + *infinitive* gives the statement emotional colouring such as surprise, amazement, irritation, indignation, pleasure, displeasure, etc., i.e. it emphasizes the speaker's personal attitude towards the facts stated in the sentence. The Indicative Mood represents these facts in a more matter-of-fact way.

must, should and ought to Compared

§ 110. All the three verbs serve to express obligation. *Must*, however, sounds more forceful, peremptory.

e.g. You must do it at once. (Вы должны (обязаны) сделать это немедленно.)

Both *should* and *ought to* express obligation, advisability, desirability and are used when *must* would sound too peremptory.

e.g. You should do it at once. } (Вам следует (нужно) сделать это немедленно.)
You ought to do it at once. }

Should and ought to are very much alike in meaning and are often interchangeable. In using *ought to*, however, we lay more stress on the meaning of moral obligation, whereas *should* is common in instructions and corrections.

e.g. You **ought to help** him; he is in trouble.

You **should use** the definite article in this sentence.

Notice that *ought to* cannot be used instead of the emotional *should*.

§ 111. *Must, ought to* and *should* serve to express supposition implying strong probability. *Must*, however, seems to be in more frequent use than the other two verbs.

***should* + Perfect Infinitive, *ought to* + Perfect Infinitive and *was/were to* + Perfect Infinitive Compared**

§ 112. *Should* + *Perfect infinitive* and *ought to* + *Perfect infinitive* show that the action has not been carried out though it was desirable; *was/were to* + *Perfect infinitive* indicates an action that has not been carried out though it was planned.

e.g. You **should have helped him.** }

(Now he is trouble)

You **ought to have warned him.** }

He was to have arrived last week. (*But his plans were upset by some cause or other.*)

will* and *would

§ 113. The verb *will* ' has the following forms: **will** — the present tense and **would** — the past tense. The latter form is used in two ways: a) in past-time contexts to express an actual fact and b) in present-time contexts to express unreality or as a milder and more polite form of *will*.

¹ *Will* and *would* may also be used as verbs of full predication (not modal verbs). *Will* may be used as a regular verb (*wills, willed*). It means *проявлять волю, велеть, заставлять, внушать*. *Would* is a defective verb. It is used with reference to the present and means 'желать'. It is found mainly in poetry and like the verb *to wish* is followed by an object clause (see "Verbs", § 132), e.g. / *would I were a careless child*.

While *shall* and *should are* treated as two different verbs in modern English, *will* and *would* are considered to be the forms of the same verb, its original meaning being that of **volition**.¹ However, in some of their meanings the use of *will* is parallel only to *would* which denotes an actual fact in the past; in other meanings *will* is found alongside *would* which expresses unreality in the present or serves as a milder or more polite form of *will*.

§ 114. The use of *will* and *would* which denotes an actual fact in the past is parallel in the following cases:

1) When they express **habitual or recurrent actions**,

e.g. She **will (would) sit** for hours under the old oak tree looking at the beautiful country around her (...любит [любила] сидеть, обычно сидит [сидела]...).

In addition to indicating a habitual action, *will (would)* in this case implies willingness, personal interest on the part of the doer of the action. *Will (would)* in this meaning is found in affirmative sentences and is followed by the simple infinitive.

In present-time contexts *will* in this meaning is not common. In past-time contexts *would* is mainly characteristic of literary style.

e.g. Then there were weekends when he **would ride** over to the house of one farmer or another and **spend** a couple of nights on the hills.

2) When they express **refusal to perform an action**,

e.g. The doctor knows I **won't be operated on**.

He was wet through, but he **wouldn't change**.

This meaning is found in negative sentences; *will (would)* is followed by the simple infinitive. In Russian it is usually rendered as *никак не хочу, ни за что не хотел*.

3) When they are used with lifeless things to show that **a thing fails to perform its immediate function**.

e.g. My fountain pen **won't (wouldn't) write**.

The door **won't (wouldn't) open**.

¹ Volition is a general term which includes such meanings as willingness, readiness, consent, intention and determination to perform an action.

b) Both *would rather* ('d rather) and *would sooner* ('d sooner) followed by an infinitive without *to* mean 'to prefer'.

e.g. "I'd rather do it myself," said Luke.

He'd sooner die than let me think he was a failure.

e) *Would... mind* in interrogative and negative sentences means 'to object'.

e.g. Would you mind my staying here for a while? I wouldn't mind your telling them about Hardy.

Would...mind in interrogative sentences may also express a polite request.

e.g. Would you mind getting me a cup of tea?

§ 117. *Would* also occurs in certain subordinate clauses where it is structurally dependent (for a detailed treatment of this case see "Verbs", § 132).

e.g. I wish the rain would stop for a moment.
I wish they wouldn't insist on it.

need

§ 118. The modal verb *need* may be used either as a defective or as a regular verb.

1) *Need* as a defective verb has only one form which is the present tense. In reported speech it remains unchanged. It is followed by the infinitive without *to*.

Need expresses necessity. When reference is made to the present or future it is followed by the simple infinitive. It is used in negative and interrogative sentences.¹

In interrogative sentences *need* usually implies that there is no necessity of performing the action.

e.g. You needn't be afraid of me. (Вам не нужно/незачем бояться меня.)

You need not meet him unless you'd like to. Need I repeat it? (Нужно ли/К чему мне повторять это?)

¹ Occasionally it may be found in affirmative sentences but it is not typical.

In negative sentences it is not always the verb *need* that is in the negative form; the negation may be found elsewhere in the sentence.

e.g. I *don't think* we need give her any more of our attention. I need *hardly* say that I agree with you.

In combination with the Perfect infinitive *need* expresses an action which has been performed though it was unnecessary. It implies a waste of time or effort.

e.g. You needn't have come. The deal is off. (Вам незачем (не к чему) было приходить. Вы зря пришли.) It was obvious. You needn't have protested. We needn't have told him a lie even if we didn't want to tell him the truth. (Нам незачем (не к чему) было лгать ему... Мы зря солгали ему...)

Note. Note that the Russian sentence *Вам не следует/не надо беспокоиться (волноваться)* is rendered in English as *You needn't worry (be nervous)*.

2) As a regular verb *need* can have all the necessary forms, including the verbals. It also expresses necessity. It is followed by the infinitive with *to* and is mainly used in interrogative and negative sentences (like the defective *need*).

e.g. He did not need to explain.

You don't need to tell me that you are sorry.

Did you need to read all those books?

It should be noted that this *need* is in more common use than the defective *need*, particularly in American English.

Note. The regular verb *need* may be followed by a noun or pronoun. But in this case *to need* is not a modal verb.

e.g. He **needs** a new coat. **Does he need** my help? He **does not need** anything.

dare

§ 119. The modal verb *dare* may also be used as a regular and as a defective verb.

1) *Dare* as a defective verb has two forms which are the present and the past forms. It means 'to have the courage or impertinence to do something.' Its use is very restricted. In present-day English it is mainly found in questions beginning with *how*, which are actually exclamations, and in negative sentences.

e.g. How dare you say that! How dare she come here!
How many years is it since we danced together? I daren't think.
He dared not look at her.

2) *Dare* as a regular verb has all the necessary forms including the verbals. It has the same meaning as the defective *dare*. Its use is also restricted. It is mainly found in negative sentences.

e.g. He does not dare to come here again.

She told me she had never dared to ask him about it.
No one dared to live in the house since.

3) Note the colloquial set phrase / *dare say*.

e.g. I dare say I looked a little confused.
My son is not in town, but I dare say he will be before long.

In Russian this phrase is usually rendered as *очень возможно, пожалуй, полагаю, осмелюсь сказать*.

***shouldn't* + Perfect Infinitive, *oughtn't to* + Perfect Infinitive and *needn't* + Perfect Infinitive Compared**

§ 120. *Shouldn't* + Perfect infinitive and *oughtn't to* + Perfect infinitive show that an action has been carried out though it was undesirable; *needn't* + Perfect infinitive indicates that an action has been carried out though it was unnecessary.

e.g. You shouldn't have come (because you are ill).

You oughtn't to have written to them (*because your letter upset them*).

You needn't have come (*because the work is finished*).

You needn't have written to them (*because I sent them a telegram*).

Expressions of Absence of Necessity

§ 121. The main verbs expressing necessity are: *must*, *to have to*, *to be to*, *should* and *ought to*.

Yet care should be taken to remember that the verbs *must*, *to be to*, *should* and *ought to* in their negative forms do not express absence of necessity (see the use of these verbs above).

Absence of necessity is expressed by the negative forms of *to have to* and *need*.

In the present tense:

e.g. You don't have to go there.

You needn't go there.

The two verbs generally differ in that *needn't* + infinitive indicates that the speaker gives authority for the non-performance of some action, whereas *don't (doesn't) have* + infinitive is used when absence of necessity is based on external circumstances.

Cf. You needn't come here. (*I'll manage everything without your help*.)

You don't have to come to the Institute tomorrow. (*There will be no lectures tomorrow*.)

In the past tense (where the regular form of the verb *need* is found) the two verbs are similar in meaning. They both indicate that there was no necessity, and hence no action. But *to need* is not in common use.

e.g. You did not have to go there.

You did not need to go there.

Note. Care should be taken not to use *You needn't have gone there* as an expression of absence of necessity because it means that an action was carried out though it was unnecessary.

FORMS EXPRESSING UNREALITY

§ 122. As has been said above, owing to certain historical changes, we find a variety of forms expressing unreality in present-day English (see also "Verbs", § 73).