

ԳՐԱԿԱՆՈՒԹՈՒՆ

1. **И. Х. Дворецкий**, Латинско-русский словарь, Москва, 1986
2. **В. К. Мюллер**, Англо - русский словарь, М., 1967
3. **А. Г. Саркисян, Р. Х. Акопян**, Русско-армянский словарь юридических терминов и перифраз, Ереван, 2005
4. **Հ. Ա. Ասմանգուլյան, Մ. Ի. Հովհաննիսյան**, Անգլերեն-հայերեն բառարան, Երևան, 1984
5. The Oxford Dictionary of Current English, L., 1944
6. Random House Webster's Build Your Power Vocabulary, Copyright, 1998
7. The Origins and Development of the English Language, Thomas Pyles John Algeo, 1992

ЮРИДИЧЕСКИЕ ТЕРМИНЫ ЛАТИНСКОГО ПРОИСХОЖДЕНИЯ В АНГЛИЙСКОМ ЯЗЫКЕ

Н. А. РАПЯН

В статье рассматриваются современные юридические термины, первоисточником которых является латинский. По мнению лингвистов большая часть лексикона английского языка имеет латинское происхождение. В английском языке современные юридические термины в основном образованы от латинских корней.

Автор раскрывает грамматические особенности юридических терминов латинского происхождения.

LEGAL TERMS OF LATIN ORIGIN IN ENGLISH

N. L. RAPYAN

The article is mainly about modern legal terms, the roots of which came from Latin language.

Scholars estimate that about half of all English words in current use are of Latin origin. So a great number of Latin words helped to shape modern legal terms. The grammatical and lexical meanings are discussed as well.

PRAGMATIC INTERFERENCE OF MODALITY

S. S. AMIRKHANYAN

GSU lecturer of english department

Modality in English and other languages has been the focus of attention of scholars from distinct disciplines and approaches over the last thirty years. Within linguistics, the study of modality has witnessed a gradual shift from a monolithic, static conception to a more **dynamic** understanding of modality taking into account the relevance of linguistic and extralinguistic contextual factors in the production and interpretation of modal utterances in discourse (Bybee & Fleischman, 1995). Modality can best be defined on the basis

of three parameters: sense conveys the basic meaning of a modal expression, on a scale from potentiality to necessity; source concerns the factors to which the modality is ascribed, participant-internal, participant-external or epistemic source; the scope of modality is the part of the utterance that is modified. The parameter of scope is most important to the remainder of this article. Grammatical modal expressions can have scope over the predicate. Second, grammatical modal expressions can have scope over the predication. Third, grammatical modal expressions can have scope over the proposition. The Modality is usually expressed by compound verbs. While it is done by auxiliary verbs in English. Thus it is important to distinguish compound verbs with modality from others for developing a practical English machine translation system. Modals play a vital role in text processing conducted by the reader and in thematic organization undertaken by the writer. Modality as such poses serious difficulties for learners as well as native speakers. The present article draws attention to modals as pragmatic categories in use. It focuses among other aspects on the complex sentence that has a condition in its subordinate clause and a modal in its main clause and claims that learning such correct construction and appropriate use have got to be in context. The purpose of this article is to find out semantic-pragmatic aspects of modal acquisition as well as to discuss how and to what extent modality is expressed in literature and in our daily speech.

(1) How can modality be aptly and comprehensively defined on both semantic and pragmatic grounds?

(2) What linguistic devices can be considered carriers of modal meaning?

(3) What are the means whereby each modal device modulates the speaker's involvement which is interpreted from the utterance of that sentence in context?

(4) How can the modal meaning in general and its dynamic relation to the context of utterance in particular, be adequately accounted for from theoretical and descriptive standpoint?

(5) How can we characterize the enriching (reinforcing or cumulative) effect of contextual factors in the unfolding of "modal" meaning/s in a given piece of discourse? According to Quirk (1985, 219) "modality may be defined as the manner in which the meaning of a clause is qualified so as to reflect the speaker's judgment of the likelihood of the proposition it expressed being true." On the other hand, modality is a difficult concept to define especially in cross-linguistic studies as Bybee and Fleischman (1995, 3) point out "because of the extent to which languages differ in their mapping of the relevant semantic content onto linguistic form. "Frequently it is distinguished between intrinsic and extrinsic modality (Quirk, 1985) although other terminologies such as root and epistemic modality, deontic and epistemic modality may be encountered epistemic modality is concerned with matters of knowledge, belief, or opinion rather than fact.

In her study "The Semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries" Coates (1983, 18) points out that epistemic modality is concerned with the speaker's assumptions or assessment of possibilities and, in most cases, it indicates the speaker's confidence (or lack of confidence) in the truth of the proposition expressed. Besides modal verbs there exist other linguistic expressions of modality, which might be referred to as modal expressions (Huddleston and Pullum, 2002) or stance markers (Biber, 1999). These include modal adjectives (possible,

likely), modality adverbs (certainly, possibly, undoubtedly), other verbs (seem, appear, insist, require), and nouns (possibility, necessity, permission). The argument is that a text world model is particularly adequate for the description of the way in which advertising discourse is processed in an active, dynamic, context-dependent way. Modality is as an instrument for discourse. The analysis framework of modality can be applied as a instrument

In Webster's Collegiate Dictionary **modality** is explained as "the quality or state of being modal: classification of logical propositions according to their asserting or denying the possibility, contingency or necessity of their content". Modality is also a facet of illocutionary force signaled by grammatical devices that express either general intent of a speaker or a speaker's degree of commitment to the expressed proposition's believability, obligatoriness, reality. In English sentence modality is usually divided into two general types – epistemic and deontic.

. The term **epistemic** is related to the word epistemology, which means theories of knowing. It includes all the ways in which speakers indicate their degree of commitment to the truth of a given proposition (Berk, 1999). The term **deontic** is a semantic label. It derives from the Greek word deontology, which refers to "the science of duty". Deontic modality involves language and potential action; when speakers order, promise or place an obligation on someone, they usually exploit linguistic forms that express deontic modality. Deontic modality is sometimes called root modality, because historically epistemic meanings derive from the deontic. As a rule, in an active sentence deontics meanings attach only to animate, usually human subjects. Most modals do have distinct past tense forms, which may be found intuitively. However we should remember that tense is simply a matter of form not meaning. The past tense of *can* is *could*, the past tense of *shall* is *should* and the

Past tense of *may* is *might*. "The {-d} or {-t} ending on these words is simply a manifestation of the typical {-ed} past tense inflection and all of these forms date back to Old English" (Berk, 1999; 132). *Must* was an Old English past tense form and the corresponding present tense *mot-* was lost during Middle English times. *Ought* was the past tense form of the Old English verb meaning *to own* from which Modern English *owe* is derived. In contrast to them *will* and *would* are the only modals that are routinely contracted in speech.

For example:

1. *If I believed in God I'd be a priest.* ("Theatre" p. 183)
2. *"I'll pay it back", Mike said.* ("Fiesta" p.179)

According to Ehrman modal auxiliaries are defined as "closed class of verbs which may occupy the first position of a verb phrase, which may not be immediately preceded by another verb, which may invert with the subject in interrogation, and which are negated directly by not" A fifth characteristic offered by Palmer is called 'code' – substitute forms, as in the second clause of *I can swim and so can John*. Really modal auxiliaries represent a very special class of verbs in English, as they existed even before Old English; their peculiarities are the result of linguistic events in the ancient Germanic languages. All the other major modern Germanic languages such as Dutch, Swedish, Danish, and Norwegian and of course German have these same auxiliaries.

English	German (pl., sing.)	Dutch (pl., sing.)
Can	können, kann	kunnen, kan
Dare	dürfen, darf	
Will	wollen, will	willen, wil
May	mögen, mag	mogen, mag
Must	müssen, muss	moeten, moet

It becomes clear from the above table that the words in the list share the same etymological root, which proves the fact that their origins go back to old Germanic languages, but because of semantic drift, these words may no longer be proper translations of each other. For example, the German verb 'dürfen' is closer in meaning to the English verb 'may' than to 'dare'. The Dutch verb 'durven' is not included in the list, as its modal use has disappeared. After a short historical survey of modality, let us pass to the main topic of our research, i.e. how modality is expressed in modern English discourse.

Epistemic and Root Modalities at the Semantic-Pragmatic Interface

The difference between the imposing and describing uses of modals (root and epistemic contrast) should be considered as a pragmatic generalization rather than viewed as polysemy. Thus, if a modal verb simply expresses the application of some particular modality towards the event or action, pragmatic factors will determine what appropriate entity is understood as imposing the modality, and upon what entity it is imposed. Therefore, the root modals are interpreted in two different ways. In the first way, the speaker is taken as imposing the modality by stating it, in the other way, some other entity, which may be elsewhere specified in the discourse, is the source of the modality. In saying "you must be home by ten", a parent imposes an obligation on a child. In saying *John can have three cookies*, a speaker grants permission or lists the maximum allowance given to him by his new diet.

For example: *That sentence must be uttered by every man in the room*

(a) *They'll all be turned into monkeys*

(b) *because it is the law.*

(c) *It will become true.*

The analysis of epistemic modality is presented not as a kind of modality unrelated to root modality, but as an essentially metaphorical application of our sociophysical modal concepts to the epistemic world. We have seen that such a unified viewpoint is possible if we analyze modality in terms of general forces and barriers – evidently these are the basic sociophysical concepts in terms of which we understand our mental processes. With the proper appeal to our pragmatic interpretation processes, there is no need to differentiate many aspects of the semantic structure of root and epistemic modals; in particular, there is no need to assume that there is a semantic specification of modality imposer and imposes built into the meaning of the two kinds of modals. The two senses must be kept distinct, with a metaphorical mapping linking the two domains in regular, and given the broader metaphorical system of the language, perhaps even predictable ways. This metaphorical mapping preserves the directional relationship between the two domains. The root/epis-

temic contrast is not best treated as two purely pragmatically conditioned interpretations of a single semantics, but rather as a motivated polysemy relationship. One reason is that the metaphorical mapping involved appears to be a linguistic convention: it is a fact about the semantics of English that these specific lexical items. **Performativity** is a familiar concept from speech-act theory which in fact is a speech-act existing with the help of the utterance. In other words, speech-act is performed through the utterance. It also largely depends on the *speaker*, the *here* and the *now*, though it does not require a verbal expression. Thus saying *It is probable that it is snowing* the speaker performs an assessment of probability at the time and place of speaking. At the same time some linguistic expressions which have modal performative uses may also be used descriptively. For example saying *It was probable that it snowed*, *probable* is used descriptively. Modal performativity affects the distinction that exists between illocutionary and propositional levels of meaning.

Words expressing certainty (*certainly, surely, assuredly, of course, apparently*).

This group is extremely common to all the types of fiction texts.

For example:

1. **Of course**, *I have a man to do the rough work for me, but the ideas are mine.* (“Theatre” p. 14)

2. Words expressing supposition (*perhaps, maybe, possibly, probably*). Let’s analyze this theory on the example *It may rain tomorrow*. On its subjective reading this sentence expresses the view of someone who reasons on the basis of personal and perhaps incomplete evidence. On its objective interpretation it is used to state a conclusion based on more reliable and complete scientific data and measurements. As we know the epistemic interpretations occur when modal operators are understood in terms of ‘What is known? Known by whom? And when?’ It follows that subjective interpretations of epistemic modals are limiting case when the speaker is the only member of the group and bases the modal claim on his or her private beliefs. Subjective interpretations come out as the limiting case where the speaker’s and various other options exist for building more complex notions of ‘relevant community’. The epistemic modal in the (1) is similar to the performative verbs in (a) and (b). Of course, there are several differences between epistemic modals and the class of performatives. For instance, epistemic modal verbs lack syntactically parenthetical uses; more importantly, they don’t involve a verbal act, but rather a mental act of evaluation of a state of affairs (Faller, 2002). However both subjective epistemics and performatives are tied to the *here* and *now* of the conversational exchange. In this sense, epistemic modals are close to a class of modal verbs such as *think, infer, conclude*, etc.

For example:

1. **I think** *he’s a nice friend for Roger to have.* (“Theatre”, p. 105)

2. **I suppose** *I can’t blame them.* (“Theatre”, p. 52)

Semi-auxiliaries are highly problematic. They behave in consistently and somewhat idiosyncratically. One reason for this is that they are relative newcomers. Many semi-auxiliaries have been borrowed from other languages either directly or indirectly. *Have to, have got to and had better* all use native lexical items, but while *be going to* contains native English words, the actual construction is modeled on the French *Je vais* (“I go; I am going”). The words *able, certain and sure* were borrowed from the French and *seem and likely* were borrowed from the Norse (Scandinavians). Some of these words entered into

semi-auxiliary construction early on. *Seem to* and *had to* appear in texts by 1300 and *by sure* by 1400. But *appear to* and *be able to* don't materialize until the sixteenth century. Because they are lexically complex and because they are relatively new constructions, semi-auxiliaries are still in a state of flux. Even highly educated native speakers are sometimes stymied when they attempt to exploit a semi-auxiliary in a particular sentence (Berk, 1999).

Epistemic Semi-Auxiliaries *Be going to* is a widely used semi-auxiliary that has both epistemic and deontic meanings. Epistemic *be going to* is used to predict event, very much like epistemic *will*. If an event is imminent, a speaker will choose *be going to* rather than *will*.

For example:

1. *I don't know how I'm **going to** pay my rent at the end of the week.*
2. *I'm not **going to** see you anymore.* (It is perfectly natural that I won't see you any more.)

Seem to and *appear to* be also semi-auxiliaries that express degrees of certainty or, more accurately, uncertainty. These semi-auxiliaries share the same meanings as their homophones *seem* and *appear*. But ***seem to*** and *appear to* are semi-auxiliaries and they can co-occur with any kind of lexical verb, including some copulas.

For example:

1. *Authors don't **seem to** write the parts they used to write when I was a young fellow.*
2. *It **seemed to** him that she had in her something quite individual.*

Deontic Semi-Auxiliaries- Semi-auxiliaries expresses roughly the same range of deontic meanings that we found among models. Although semi-auxiliaries and modal auxiliaries look very different and have very different histories, combined they represent a relatively unified semantic system.

Semi-Auxiliaries Used to Express Obligation.

Have to and *have got to* are used deontically in directives and other contexts in which obligation is being expressed.

1. *Of course we **had to** cut the other woman a lot in rehearsals.*
2. *When one's starting like I am one **has to** put up with what one can get.*

The intention of this work is to show that the analysis framework of modality can be analysis as a instrument for such fragment of texts according to similar factors of assumed knowledge attributed to the speaker; a working definition of a counterfactual utterance, for example, is one in which the counter factuality is an inference based on the contextual assessment of the speaker's knowledge of facts to the contrary of the counterfactual or hypothetical utterance. On the one hand it offers a functional description of the representation of hypothetical meaning in the form of modality, drawing on the mechanical process of grammaticalization theory and the cognitive practices of pragmatics to explain hypothaticity from a synchronic as well as a diachronic perspective. Thus as well as presenting a new perspective on grammaticalization processes in general studies of the grammaticalization of modality in varies way assist considerably in building a deeper understand of hypothetical modal meaning based on diachronic factors. It is not only non-factual modality, as described above which may be discussed interims of the degree of knowledge accorded to the model utterance by the hearer. Hypothetical conditionals which may usually refer to

those of non –past time reference, but use the simple in the protests and *would* +v in the apodosis. In other words lower-case ‘hypothetical’ will refer to the general category of all ranges of hypothetical meaning. Hypothetical will refer to specific subcategory of hypothetical meaning in which the speaker is uncertain unaware of the facts surrounding the utterance of a hypothesis. However, our factual knowledge about a situation in an indication of proximity to reality not distance from reality, though the hypothetical utterance which is founded on such factual knowledge is certainly distant from reality.

1. A) Would I could you do me a favor?

‘We need to distinguish between the ‘*semantic*’ meaning and the ‘*pragmatic*’ meaning of

Can you pass the salt? Between the

- Literal meaning: *Are you able to pass the salt?*
- and its basic structure of meaning (pragmatic meaning):

Modality expresses the mode within which the propositional content of a sentence is presented as certain, reliable, or obligatory and it functions to regulate interpersonal relations. Point of view indicates a particular way of conceptualizing and refers to worldview. In relation to, or as a part of, modal functions, the following issues are considered: point of view, deontic and epistemic modality, evaluative adjectives and adverbs, and verbal sentiment. The paper consists of a theoretical part and an application part. In the theoretical part, first the term “modality” is defined; this is followed by a discussion of the relationship between modality and point of view. Modality and point of view in media discourse. Modality: Basic Concepts Modality is a broad expression of a speaker’s attitude toward the situation or event described by a sentence or in regard to the proposition expressed by the sentence. It is an important linguistic tool for realizing the interpersonal function and expressing social roles between the speaker/writer and the hearer. The English modal verb will have always presented problems for descriptive classification within the modal categories traditionally divided between epistemic and non-epistemic. On the one hand, its role as a marker of futurity does not help to distinguish it from many deontic meanings of obligation or necessity; while on the other, its future meanings have often been associated with epistemic senses. Historically, it seems to present anomalies in the form of omnitemporal meanings appearing as early as Old English times.

Difference between ‘semantics’ and ‘pragmatics.’

‘We need to distinguish between the ‘*semantic*’ meaning and the ‘*pragmatic*’ meaning of

Can you pass the salt?

Between the- Literal meaning: *Are you able to pass the salt?*

Semantics is concerned with meanings relatively **stable out of context**; arbitrary,

analyzable in terms of logical conditions of truth circumstances.

- Pragmatics: concerned with *beliefs and inferences* about the nature of assumptions made by participants, and the *purposes* for which utterances are used in context of communicative language use. Concerned with hearers’ *indirect meaning*, beyond what is said, what is relevant to discourse, what may be constrained by “culture”. Such beliefs often thought to be cognitively “natural” (not learned, not arbitrary), not subject to truth condi-

tions. (“They are the way things **are**”). The linguistic features selected in this study have been categorized into the following groups: a) verbal modality: can, may , might, could, would , should, will , shall , must used in now assertive environments without third person singular s and without to complementation) b) Semi-auxiliary verbs: to seem and to appear c) Non-verbal modality modal adjectives (likely, possible, probable) style disjoints (personality, possibly, probably) adverbs which express some degree of doubt conviction (clearly indeed, obviously, surely undoubtedly) and adverbs which convey the speakers attitude curiously, fortunately, interestingly, surprisingly d) Parenthetical forms: first person subjects with verbs such as believe/guess or think, which have been considered to convey the writers attitude towards the propositions uttered and therefore as bearers of modality .

Dynamic Modality—Dynamic modality sometimes also called *facultative* modality (Gossens 1985) or inherent modality (Hengeveld 1988) is traditionally characterizes as a description of a capacity to the subject-participant of the clause (the subject is able to perform the action expressed by the main verb in the clause of the kind expressed in the modal auxiliary (a) or the predicative adjective in (b)

Modality and point of view in media discourse. Modality: Basic Concepts Modality is a broad expression of a speaker’s attitude toward the situation or event described by a sentence or in regard to the proposition expressed by the sentence. It is an important linguistic tool for realizing the interpersonal function and expressing social roles between the speaker/writer and the hearer/reader. Modality can be both epistemic and deontic. Epistemic modality indicates the means by which speakers/writers express judgment on the truth of the propositions they utter/write. Deontic modality is concerned with the criterion by which speakers/writers decide which future events are necessary, possible, desirable, etc. Most modal expressions can be used in both ways. For example, there are ambiguities in the interpretations of the sentence

For Example: “Peter must have a bath every day.”

There are degrees of certainty, probability, or obligation in modal operators respectively. They are called values, and these can be classified into high, median, and low values, as shown in the following table of modal operators. Values in modality must, should, ought to, need to, has to, is to Median value will, would, shall Low value may, might, can, could here are various ways of expressing modality, or expressing different degrees of the speaker or writer’s commitment to the proposition, than through auxiliary verbs; adverbs e. g., supposedly, possibly, adjectives e. g., probable, likely, nouns e. g., likelihood, possibility, and verbs e. g., wish, reckon, regret can also be used. Schematizes the relationships between modal systems and the non-linguistic concepts that each of the modal systems realizes. The terms boulomaic modality and perception modality are used as follows. Boulomaic modality, as a subcategory of deontic modality, expresses the desire or wish of the speaker, as in I wish..., I hope..., I regret....

Modality and point of view in media discourse. A difference in the degree or value of certainty, probability, or perceptual commitment leads to a different attitudinal stance on that part of speaker or writer. Let us next turn to the problem of point of view in relation to modality. Modality and point of view this section discusses the relationship between modality and point of view. The basic concept of point of view is introduced, and this is followed by a discussion of internal and external points of view.. No text or fiction can be

totally objective or value-free it is the writer's point of view, "angle of vision," "angle of telling," perspective, or authorial interest that determines the essence of a story's style and that provides the story with its particular "feel".

This viewing stance is characterized by the use of first-person pronouns *_I, we_* and verbal sentient. Verb sentient are words that express feelings, thoughts, and perceptions,

e. g., *feel, suffer, or think.*,_ External focalization suggests an objective, neutral, and panchronic stance outside the consciousness of participants involved in the story, from which the events and characters are describe.

The investigation carried out in this article involves the following predications: I have discussed that linguistic modality has been generalized from the real-world domain to the domains of reasoning and speech acts. The advantage of such an approach is that it allows us to unify our account of contrast between root and epistemic senses of the modal verbs and of other similarity ambiguous lexical items such as *insist*. Such words are ambiguous in a systematic and regular manner between root, epistemic, and speech-act senses, and the epistemic and speech-act senses are extensions of the root senses. Attempts to find single superordinate analyses which include both root-and epistemic modal meanings have been unsuccessful. But the problem is removed by taking into account our understanding of mental processes as well as of the current speech-act utterance, as involving forces and barriers analogous to those involved in "real-world" physical and social interactions. Without taking into account this background metaphor, trying to unify deontic and epistemic modal meaning is like trying to find the common semantic features of "optimism" without basing our analysis on the knowledge that physical sight is a primary metaphor for world-view in the mental domain. The basic semantic analyses of the modals which we have discussed depend on the pragmatic interpretation. That is, the semantic structure of the modal verbs does not explicitly pick out either subject or object (or any specific syntactic or semantic role) as the participant on whom the modality rests; rather it is the pragmatic factors which exist as an inseparable part in the speech-act setting, together with our understanding of utterances as content, epistemic object and speech act all at once. I have found out that modal auxiliaries are used to refer to such kinds of meanings in language as to speculate, to hedge, to predict, to suggest, to order, to demand, to hope, to want, etc. Further, summarizing the frequency of use of modal auxiliaries both in literature and in ordinary speech it has been revealed that the epistemic modals may form the biggest group, the deontic modals may be in the second group, and ability and habitual modals in the third group. In contrast to the primary auxiliaries *be* and *have*, modal auxiliaries are semantically rich and inflectionally impoverished. However they are to be found also in the deontic system and it is the parallelism between these that makes it possible to account for the inclusion of epistemic and deontic modality within a single overall system. Again based on the above examples, we can say that epistemic modality is concerned with the expression of the degree or nature of the speaker's commitment to the truth of what he says, matters of knowledge, belief or opinion rather than fact. Therefore, it comes out that in general it is concerned with the subjective characteristics of an utterance. On the other hand, *deontics* modality is concerned with language as action by others or by the author himself. Indeed, all that these two types of modality seem to share is the involvement of the speaker.

REFERENCES

1. **Asatryan M. E.** (2002). The Modern Armenian language. Morphology. (3rd ed). Yerevan: Yerevan State University
2. **Berk M. L.** (1999). English Syntax. From Word to Discourse. Oxford: Oxford University press.
3. **Faller M.** (2006). Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality at the Semantics/Pragmatics Interface. The University of Manchest
4. **Merriam**, Webster's Collegiate Dictionary. (10th ed.). (1993). **Springfield M. A.** Merriam- Webster.
5. **Palmer F. R.** (1986). Mood and Modality. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
6. **Palmer F. R.** (1990). Modality and the English Modals. (2nd ed). London and New York: Longman.
7. **Papafragou A.** (2006). Epistemic Modality
8. http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Modal_verb.
9. <http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Theory><http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Egocentrism>
10. **Maugham S. W.** (1985). Theatre. (2nd ed.). Moscow.

ԻՄԱՍՏԱՊՐԱԳՄԱՏԻԿ ԵՂԱՆԱԿԱՎՈՐՈՂ ԿԱՊԸ ԵՂԱՆԱԿԱՎՈՐՈՂ ԲԱՅԵՐՈՒՄ

Ս. Ս. ԱՄԻՐԽԱՆՅԱՆ

Սոդալությունը (եղանակավորությունը) սովորաբար արտահայտվում է բաղադրյալ բայերի միջոցով, ուստի հոդվածի հիմնական նպատակն է բաղադրյալ բայերի մեթոդի նկարագրությունը, մոդալային ձեռքբերումների իմաստապրագմատիկ հայեցակետերի բացահայտումը: Հեղինակը փորձում է պարզել, թե ինչպես է արտահայտվում այդ մեխանիզմը գրականության մեջ և առօրյա խոսքում: Հոդվածում դիտարկվում են առկա մեթոդների արտահայտության առաջնային վերլուծության հիմնական ձևերը, ցույց է տրվում կապը լեզվի իմացաբանության և հատուկ պրագմատիկ դիրքորոշումների միջև:

УПОТРЕБЛЕНИЕ СЕМАНТИКО-ПРАГМАТИЧЕСКИХ МОДАЛЬНЫХ ГЛАГОЛОВ

Ս. Ս. ԱՄԻՐԽԱՆՅԱՆ

Модальность выражают обычно составные глаголы. Целью этой статьи было описание нового метода обработки составных глаголов. Необходимо было также выяснить семантико-прагматические аспекты модальных приобретений. Целью статьи было также обсуждение вопроса, каким образом и в какой степени механизм выражается в литературе и в нашей повседневной речи.

В статье рассматриваются основные виды нынешних методов первичного анализа высказывания, рассмотрена связь между языковой семантикой и прагматическим установлением специальных контрастов.