#### CHAPTER II

# LITERATURE REVIEW

This chapter review of the several theories related to this research. Those are definition of semantics, definition of modality, types of modality (two kinds of modality, modal verbs, and meanings and functions), and thereview of related studies, as follows in its term.

# **2.1 Theoretical Framework**

### 2.1.1 Semantics

Abdul Chaer (2007: 289) states that the study of the linguistic meaning of morphemes, words, phrases, and sentences is called semantics. Subfields of semantics are lexical semantics, which is concerned with the meanings of words, and the meaning relationships among words; and phrasal or sentential semantics, which is concerned with the meaning of syntactic units larger than the word.

# 2.1.2 Systematic Study of Meaning

According to Kreidler in *SEMÁNTICA INGLESA's* Article states that Semantics is the systematic study of meaning and linguistic semantic is the study of how languages organize and express meanings. It means that, meaning in linguistic semantic is very needed for us to limit ourselves to the expression of meanings in a single language. Charles W. Kreidler (1998: 3) says there were three disciplines were concerned with the systematic study of meaning: psychology, philosophy and linguistics. The first is psychologist which was interest in how individual humans learn, how they retain, recall or loss information. The second is philosophies of language which were concerned with how we know how any particular fact that we know or accept as true was related to other possible facts. Then, the last systematic study of meaning is about linguistics, linguistics want to understand how language works.

#### 2.1.3 Modality

Kreidler (1998: 239) stated that modality is people who talk about factual matters. Indeed, modality gives the information about what is true and what is not true, what has happened and what has not happened. They also talk about what may be true or not, what ought to be and what ought not to be, what certain individuals are capable of and what is impossible for them, what obligations they have to do or to refrain from doing. Kreidler (1998: 240) adds statement that modality can be expressed in nouns like duty, obligation, probability, likelihood; in adjectives like necessary, possible, likely, in adverbs such as obviously, probably, perhaps; but for description of how modality is expressed in English we need to concentrate on modal verbs, verbs like ought and may. The writer takes examples which are taken from a book "Introducing English Semantics" by Kreidler (1998: 239-240), as below:

- a. It's your duty to visit your ailing parents.
- b. You ought to visit your ailing parents.

These two examples are about obligation. Both of them have same proposition that are to visit your ailing parents. They also have same statement about that proposition, that is, your duty and what you ought to do. In other example is about possibility:

- a. Jessica is possibly at home now.
- b. Jessica may be at home now.

Both of them are nearly synonymous sentences containing the same proposition and making equivalent statements about the proposition a possibility or what may be.

#### 2.1.3.1 Modal Verbs

In the book titled Mood and Modality there is statement by F. R. Palmer (1981: 278) written that modal verbs are a closed set of verbs that are used immediately before the main verb in a sentence to reflect the mood or attitude of either the speaker or the subject of the sentence from the perspective of the speaker.

According to Po Ching Yip and Don Rimmington (2004: 100) explain that it is, perhaps, fortunate for study of modal verbs in which there is considerable discussion of English that there is no doubt that English has a set of modal verbs that can be formally defined. They are May, Can, Must, Ought (to), Will and Shall, and marginally, Need and Dare (including Might, Could, Would and Should). Frederic, Agnes, and John (2011: 33) add statement that in the English language, a modal verb isa type of auxiliary verb. The key way to identify a modal verb is by its defectiveness (they have neither participles nor infinitives). In addition, modal verbs unlike other verbs, its do not take the inflection -s or -es in the third person singular.

#### 2.1.3.1.1 Must

As Joos (1964: 147–148) points out, a child of four may ask the meaning of duty but is not likely to ask about the meaning of must. The child knows what must means, but neither a child nor an adult is capable of explaining the meaning. It also has to be said that the modal verbs have numerous subtleties in what they express in different contexts. They have shifted semantically throughout the history of the language, and different speakers of the language differ somewhat in which modal verbs they prefer for what meanings. So that why, modal "must" explains deeper as below.

Kreidler (1998: 240) stated that modal verb must has two meanings, which we can first illustrate with two little dialogues. Suppose a young athlete plans to enter an important and difficult race and we say to him or her, "If you expect to win, you must train very hard," and he or she answers, "I will." Suppose, on the other hand, this athlete is showing us trophies and medals that she or he has won in previous races. We might say, "If you have won so many races, youmust train very hard," and the response might be, "I do." In the first instance the verb must is about obligation, the obligation of the person denoted by you, and the statement is prospective, about actions yet to be accomplished, as shown by the answer "I will." The second dialogue has must expressing probability.

### 2.1.3.1.2Should

Downing and Locke (1992: 392) stated that modal verb should can express areas of modal meaning to express an obligation.

- a. We must leave immediately
- b. We should leave immediately

These verbs express different degrees of obligation, but probably different speakers of English do not agree on their relative rank. For this author, must, as in a, is the most forceful statement of obligation and somewhat formal. Kreidler (1998: 241) explains that modal verb should is express obligation but weaker than must. Other speakers of English may well have a different ranking. It is implying a degree of advisability.

# 2.1.3.1.3Can and May

In this section devoted to the topic of can. The writer pays attention to the register distribution of these modal and then the attention is turned to the meanings of can. Downing and Locke (1992: 387) stated that basically, there are three kinds of modal meanings in this pair, namely: possibility, ability and permission. In contrast to some other modals (e.g. exclamatory wish expressed by may) and their meanings, all of the mentioned meanings of can are common. In other side, Leech (1971: 75 – 77) stated that may can express three meanings, while the possibility meaning is commonly used, meanings of permission and an exclamatory wish can be used as rare. Possibility that is subject-centered is expressed with the modal verbs can and may.

- a. Edward can lift 250 pounds. (He has strength and training.)
- b. Sally can speak four languages. (She has knowledge and experience.)
- c. You may/can leave the room. (You have permission.)

In examples above, if the potential for an act is entirely in the subject, can is used. If the potential rests in another person's authority, may is the preferred verb. However, this distinction has been decliningfor a long time, and can is often used to express permission, as in the last sentence above.

The permission and possibility meanings of may have already been more or less discussed in the previous subchapter. However, there are some more details to be added. Although the possibility meaning of can and may can be basically considered overlapping, it is possible distinguish between factual (may)/immediate and theoretical (can) possibility (Leech, 1971: 82).

# 2.1.3.1.4 Could

In the book of modality theory that Kreidler (1998: 243) has wrote, he stated that to express personal potential in the past *could* is used. It is thus the past tense form of can.

a. When I was younger, I could run a mile in four minutes, butI couldn't do better than that.

Modal verb could can express a reduced potential, a lesser degree of possibility at any time.

b. I could still run a mile in four minutes if I tried, but I couldn't do it easily.

# 2.1.3.1.5 Might

The permission and possibility meanings of may have already been more or less discussed in the previous subchapter. The past tense form of may is might, which sometimes expresses permission at some time in the past, but usually only in reported speech: a. Our teacher said we might leave the room for ten minutes.

In other example, we would not use might in place of had permission to in this sentence:

b. We had permission to leave the room for a while yesterday.

#### 2.1.3.1.6 Will and Would

The next modal verbs discuss are will and would, which are not always modal verbs. There is a wide range of meanings that can be expressed by the will are prediction/predictability, intention, will and insistence. By the meaning of predictability, we can refer to habitualpredictions. In this case, the prediction is a result of the previous activity in a conditional clause.

a. This summer is hot, and next summer will be hot, too.

The second clause in this sentence gives the proposition, next summer being hot, 100 percent probability, but since it is not yet afact, as the first clause presumably is. Kreidler (1998: 246) said that it is a prediction.

### 2.1.3.1.7 Negative Modal Verb

Negative modal verb are modal verb that there is negativitymeans it can be an opposite meaning. The negative modal verbs are illustrated below:

a. We mustn't stay here.

15

b. We don't have to stay here.

c. We oughtn't to stay here.

d. We shouldn't stay here.

Examples above are made by Kreidler (1998: 242) in his book. There is a great difference between "a" and the rest of these. The firstsays that we are obliged not to stay; negativity is attached to theembedded proposition: not staying is our obligation. Kreidler (1998: 242) explains that the others say that we are not obliged to stay;negativity applies to the modal verbs; staying is not an obligation. Schematically the difference can be represented this way:

Must: not + stay here

Not + have/ought/should: stay here

# 2.1.3.2 Two Kinds of Modality

Johanna (2006: 70) stated that the second parameter that is needed to describe the semantics of modality is the source of the modality. This is a refinement of the distinction between epistemic modality and deontic modality (Bybee 1985; Bybee et al. 1994; Coates 1983; Lyons 1977; Palmer 1986; Perkins 1983; Sweetser 1982). Epistemic modality is "concerned with matters of knowledge, belief" (Lyons 1977: 793), with "opinion rather than fact" (palmer, 1986: 681-682), whereas deontic modality is "concerned with the necessity or possibility of acts performed by morally responsible agents" (palmer, 1986: 823). Obligation (must, have to) and permission (may, can) form the major types of deontic modality.

### 2.1.3.2.1 Deontic Modality

As stated by Kratzer (1981: 331) and Palmer (1986: 823), Deontic modality is traditionally defined in terms of permission and obligation. Deontic modality is concerned with possibility and necessity in terms of freedom to act (including ability, permission, and duty). English examples include She can go (ability), You may go (permission), You should go (request), and You must go (command). In English as in many other languages, some of the same words are used for deontic modality as for epistemic modality, and the meaning is distinguished from context: He must be there by now (epistemic) versus He must be there tomorrow at noon (deontic).

### 2.1.3.2.2 Epistemic Modality

According to the categorization in Bache and Davidsen Nielsen (qtd. in Dostálová. 2006: 4), who also distinguish between two kinds of non-factuality in modality stated that epistemic modal are used to indicate the possibility or necessity of some piece of knowledge. In the epistemic use, modals can be interpreted as indicating inference or some other process of reasoning involved in coming to the conclusion stated in the sentence containing the modal. However, epistemic modals do not necessarily require inference, reasoning, or evidence. Examples of the expression of epistemic modality in English are: he might be there (low probability, substantial doubt), He may be there (possibility), He should be there by now (high probability), and He must be there by now (certitude, no doubt).

# 2.1.3.3 Meanings and Functions

Modal meanings can be expressed in several ways, such as main verbs, adverbs, intonation, inflection, auxiliary verbs, particles, adjectives, and nouns. The focus of the thesis is on modal verbs, in example the grammaticalized expressions that have or had a verbal status or that function in paradigms in which the majority of the markers have had this status, indicating the semantic domains which involve possibility and necessity as paradigmatic varians (van der Auwera & Plungian 1998: 80, van der Auwera 2001: 23)

The Cambridge Dictionary explains that we often use modal verbs or other modal expressions when we want to express an opinion or attitude about a possible fact or to control a possible action. All modal expressions are about the speaker's or writer's view of the world.

a. He's her brother. She told me.

(I know this fact for certain. I am not expressing an opinion about it. I am stating it as a fact.)

- b. He must be her brother. They look so much alike.(I am expressing an opinion about a fact because of the evidence that Ihave.)
- c. Jan always goes with us.

(I'm not expressing an attitude or opinion about this action.)

d. OK. Jan can go if she's finished.

(I'm controlling a possible action. I'm giving Jan permission.)

We can divide most modal words and expressions into two typesof meaning that the speakers or writers decide how certain something is, either in the present, future or past. They predict or speculate about a fact. We see this type of meaning when we talk about degrees of certainty, possibility, likelihood, doubt:

a. Paula can't be home yet. It's impossible. She left 10 minutes afterus.

(The speaker hears the phone ring and predicts who is ringing).

- b. There's the phone. That'll be Mum.
- c. I may go. I haven't decided yet.

The speaker or writer wants to control the action. They give andrefuse permission. They talk about obligation and necessity. They talk about how they would like the world to be:

Parent says to child that;

- a. You can come if you're good.
- b. He should take more care.
- c. You mustn't worry so much about her.

#### d. You may go now. (formal)

### 2.1.4 Related Studies

As the other writers have done in doing the research, having been aware of the previous studies is really important to get more qualified in research. In this section, the writer provides some researches that have been done before.

The first is Zdenka Smutná (2010), in his bachelor paper analyzed about the use of the modal verb can in newspaper reporting. The paper consists of two parts, a theoretical part and an analysis. The main focus of the theoretical part is on epistemic and deontic kinds of modality and the modal verb can and its meanings. As for the frequency of individual occurrences of the modal verb can, it occurred in the following sequence: possibility, ability, and permission meaning. It was found out that the reports contained a large number of modal verbs can in its possibility meaning. The analysis also proved that it is often very difficult to recognize whether an occurrence represents possibility or ability meaning.

The second is Gbegble Nada (2012). In her study, she talks about modality in Ewe about a functional exploration of epistemic adverbs. This paper has offered a descriptive overview of the different epistemic adverb in the Ewe language. As an aside, what this study may also have shown is the importance, when studying a subtle semantic domain such as (epistemic) modality in a language, of using natural data in addition to native intuitions. Nada stated that it is very difficult if not impossible to detect fine distinctions (such as those between the epistemic and strengthening uses of gódóó and kòkòkò, e.g.) on the basis of intuitions alone, or through questioning native informants.

And the last is Susi Susilowati (2012). She talk about modality realized in education article in Jakarta post in May 2011 edition. Whereas, the data of her research is modality and the data source of this research is written data taken from the education article in Jakarta Post in May edition. Based on the analyzing of the data, Susi was found that two kinds of modality were used in Education article in Jakarta post in May edition. They are modalization and modulation. In the case of modalization, the Education article in Jakarta post used probability most dominantly among the other types of modalization such as usuality. Meanwhile, in modulation, the Education article in Jakarta post used obligation most dominantly among the other types of modulation such as inclination. Furthermore, she recommend to the future researchers to use this research as a reference in conducting studies in the same field with larger data and another different data sources.

By understanding all previous study above, the writer takes modality for his research, because the writer assumes that modality is still general, so the writer wants to focus on modality in its types and its functions in different case. The writer takes Thomas hardy's The Mayor of Casterbridge as the data for this research by using modality device. The writer takes the theory from Charles W. Kreidler for analyzing the data. The writer has not find about the research that took the data from novel by using modality before.