Modality Shifts in Translating English Modal Verbs into Croatian in Legal and Literary Texts

Konjarević, Denis

J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Double Major MA Study Programme in English Language and Literature – Translation and Interpreting Studies and Philosophy

Denis Konjarević

Modality Shifts in Translating English Modal Verbs into Croatian in Legal and Literary Texts

Master's Thesis

Supervisor: Ana Werkmann Horvat, Assistant Professor

Osijek, 2023

J.J. Strossmayer University of Osijek
Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
Double Major MA Study Programme in English Language and Literature – Translation and Interpreting Studies and Philosophy

Denis Konjarević

Modality Shifts in Translating English Modal Verbs into Croatian in Legal and Literary Texts

Master's Thesis

Scientific area: humanities
Scientific field: philology
Scientific branch: English studies

Supervisor: Ana Werkmann Horvat, Assistant Professor

Osijek, 2023

Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku
Filozofski fakultet Osijek
Dvopredmetni diplomski sveučilišni studij engleskog jezika i književnosti – prevoditeljski smjer i filozofije

Denis Konjarević

Promjene u modalnosti pri prevođenju engleskih modalnih glagola na hrvatski jezik u pravnim i književnim tekstovima

Diplomski rad

Mentorica: doc. dr. sc. Ana Werkmann Horvat

Osijek, 2023.

Sveučilište J.J. Strossmayera u Osijeku
Filozofski fakultet Osijek
Odsjek za engleski jezik i književnost
Dvopredmetni diplomski sveučilišni studij engleskog jezika i književnosti – prevoditeljski smjer i filozofije

Denis Konjarević

Promjene u modalnosti pri prevođenju engleskih modalnih glagola na hrvatski jezik u pravnim i književnim tekstovima

Diplomski rad

Znanstveno područje: humanističke znanosti
Znanstveno polje: filologija
Znanstvena grana: anglistika

Mentorica: doc. dr. sc. Ana Werkmann Horvat

Osijek, 2023.

IZJAVA

Izjavljujem s punom materijalnom i moralnom odgovornošću da sam ovaj rad samostalno napisao te da u njemu nema kopiranih ili prepisanih dijelova teksta tuđih radova, a da nisu označeni kao citati s navođenjem izvora odakle su preneseni.

Svojim vlastoručnim potpisom potvrđujem da sam suglasan da Filozofski fakultet u Osijeku trajno pohrani i javno objavi ovaj moj rad u internetskoj bazi završnih i diplomskih radova knjižnice Filozofskog fakulteta u Osijeku, knjižnice Sveučilišta Josipa Jurja Strossmayera u Osijeku i Nacionalne i sveučilišne knjižnice u Zagrebu.

U Osijeku, 1. studenoga 2023.

Denis Kopjarović, 0302024820

Ime i prezime studenta, JMBAG

Abstract

This study aims to examine the general features of the translation of English modal verbs into Croatian in legal and literary texts, with an emphasis on two kinds of shifts occurring in the translation process: shifts in the strength of modal verbs and shifts in the means of expressing modality. A lack of research on translating modal verbs (and modality in general) into Croatian serves as the rationale for conducting the present study. To this end, a total of 520 randomly selected English sentences containing the modal verbs *must*, *should*, *ought to*, and *may* were extracted from legal and literary corpora and placed alongside their Croatian translations. The extracts were then analyzed in an attempt to explain the motivation for employing those translation strategies that had produced a shift in modality. This was done to find out how those strategies reflect the general characteristics of the two genres regarding modality in terms of their syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic features that influence the translation process. The analysis revealed that shifts in the strength of the aforementioned modal verbs were more frequent in the legal corpus, primarily because of the strict framework of rules and regulations legal discourse comes with. This framework affects the strength of modal expressions. Shifts in the means of expressing modality were more frequent in the literary corpus, primarily because of a high frequency of epistemic modal verbs, whose syntactic properties in the target language had prompted the translator to avoid using them for stylistic reasons.

Keywords: modality, modal verbs, modal strength, modal shift, modal translation

Sažetak

Cilj je ovog rada istražiti opće značajke prevođenja engleskih modalnih glagola na hrvatski jezik u pravnim i književnim tekstovima s naglaskom na dvije vrste promjena koje se događaju u procesu prevođenja: promjene u jačini modalnih glagola i promjene u sredstvu modalnog iskaza. Slaba zastupljenost istraživanja prevođenja modalnih glagola (i modalnosti uopće) u hrvatskom jeziku razlog je za provođenje ovoga istraživanja. U tu je svrhu prikupljeno 520 rečenica iz pravnih i književnih korpusa koje su sadržavale modalne glagole *must*, *should*, *ought to* i *may* i koje su potom bile uparene s s njihovim prijevodima na hrvatski. Prikupljena je građa zatim podvrgnuta analizi s ciljem utvrđivanja čimbenika koji su potaknuli uporabu prevoditeljskih rješenja koja su uzrokovala promjene u modalnosti u prevedenim rečenicama. To je učinjeno kako bi se utvrdilo na koji način takva rješenja odražavaju opća obilježja dvaju žanrova u pogledu njihovih sintaktičkih, semantičkih i pragmatičkih značajki koje utječu na prevoditeljski proces. Rezultati istraživanja pokazali su veću prisutnost promjena u modalnoj jačini u pravnom korpusu, ponajprije zbog snažnog kontekstualnog okvira pravila i propisa svojstvenog pravnom diskursu. Takav okvir utječe na snagu modalnih izraza. Promjene u sredstvu modalnog iskaza bile su izraženije u književnom korpusu, ponajprije zbog velike zastupljenosti epistemičkih modalnih glagola, zbog čijih je sintaktičkih svojstava u ciljnom jeziku prevoditelj iz stilskih razloga u pravilu izbjegavao njihovu uporabu u prijevodu.

Ključne riječi: modalnost, modalni glagoli, modalna jačina, promjena u modalnosti, prevođenje modalnosti

Contents

1. Introduction

Modality is widely considered one of the most challenging areas of linguistic description because of its complex nature, which comprises numerous syntactic, semantic, pragmatic, and other aspects, making it demanding to give its precise definition. In essence, modality could be defined as the speaker's attitude toward the factuality or actualization of a situation (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 173), i.e., their assessment of the extent to which a state of affairs is possible or necessary.

In both English and Croatian, the primary means of expressing modality are modal verbs. These represent a special class of verbs that cannot function independently but only as auxiliaries, i.e., "helping verbs" (Leech & Svartvik 2002: para. 477) that come directly before a lexical (main) verb in a clause and refer to its role by qualifying its meaning (Biber et al. 2002: 103). There are two fundamental modal forces: necessity and possibility. They act as a framework that embeds a wide range of modal meanings and allows for their interpretation. There are basic modal meanings: obligation, permission, logical necessity, logical possibility, probability, ability, prediction, and volition. These can be further divided into yet more specific meanings, such as, for instance, strong obligation (duty) and weak obligation (recommendation or advice), enabling the speaker to express a wide range of changes in their state of mind.

When it comes to contrastive analysis of modality, as is the case with the present thesis, there are several major factors to consider. First of all, there is what Palmer (1986: 25) calls "the interpersonal function," which denotes the interactive relationship between the speaker's and addressee's attitudes (Haliday 1994). Bearing in mind that speakers of different languages have different experiential backgrounds, conditioned above all by the cultural frameworks they come from, it follows that modal statements cannot be fully understood in isolation. They are affected, among others, by cognitive-linguistic factors, which may influence the judgment of a certain situation in a certain way and thus affect the translation process itself. Another key factor concerns the conventions of the genre being translated. For example, legal translation has to do with a highly specialized register whose esoteric nature sets it apart from general language, making it difficult for laypersons or outsiders in the legal community to understand it (Orts 2015). Furthermore, legal translation is affected by the peculiarities of different legal systems (Orts 2015). Literary translation involves a whole series of factors, which, for reasons of space,

will not be systematically presented here. Instead, only a general description of the genre will be given. According to Newmark (1998), literary translation should aim to integrate two main features: the informativeness of the text and its aesthetic quality. This means that the literary translator not only conveys the semantic content of the source text to the target reader but also intertwines it with "the entire system of aesthetic features bound up with the language of the translation" (Levy 1963, as cited in Bassnett 2002: 16), reflecting the thought, emphasis, style, rhythm, and sound of the original (Newmark 1998: 201). Finally, the translator should adhere to the norms of the target culture and be well-acquainted with its literary tradition (Newmark 1982: 18).

The aim of this paper is to investigate the general characteristics of the translation of modal verbs from English into Croatian in legal and literary texts, with an emphasis on shifts in modality occurring in the translation process. These shifts will be explained in terms of the syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects that cause them and thus play a role in opting for translation strategies. The significance of this study lies in the fact that there is a lack of research on modality in the Croatian language, particularly regarding contrastive analysis of translations. There are only a few such studies, the most prominent of which was carried out by Knežević and Brdar (2011). It analyzes the translation of modal verbs from Croatian into English and is limited to deontic modality. As far as the Croatian language is concerned, to the best of my knowledge, there are no studies on translating modal verbs in literary discourse at the moment of writing the present thesis. In this paper, each of the two genres (legal and literary) will be addressed separately and then subjected to additional comparative analysis.

The paper is structured as follows: Chapter 2 provides a theoretical overview of the subject, focusing on expounding the phenomenon of modality and its general features, with an emphasis on the English and Croatian modal verbs. The modal verbs are further analyzed in terms of their relative strength, and a brief comparative analysis of the strength relations between the Croatian modal verbs and their English counterparts is presented. Chapter 3 outlines the methods for this corpus-based register analysis, focusing on the tools used for compiling the corpus and the approach to the analysis. Chapter 4 presents the results of the analysis. This chapter is divided into two sections. The first section provides a quantitative description of the corpus, whereas the second presents a qualitative discussion. Chapter 5 summarizes the findings in the conclusion.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1. *The definition of modality*

Modality is a fairly complex linguistic category characterized by remarkable semantic ambiguity, which hinders a uniform explanation of this category and makes it challenging to give a straightforward account of its features. The preceding statement seems to be well supported by Narrog (2005: 165), who asserts that "there is hardly any grammatical category which has been given more diverging definitions, and under the label of which a wider range of phenomena has been studied." Palmer (1986: 4) states that "the real problem with [defining] modality (…) is (…) that there is no clear basic feature." Along similar lines, Shlomper (2005: 11) argues that modality is not subject to morpho-syntactic constraints (unlike other grammatical categories such as tense), which, as Varga (2016: 24) points out, may be the reason why diverse notions tend to be subsumed "under its more or less extensive scope." This is reflected in the large scale of its linguistic manifestations, which comprise morphological (e.g., modal verbs), lexical (e.g., cognition verbs), and syntactic (e.g., phrasal expressions) markers, as well as intonation, which is yet another way to express different modal meanings (Bybee & Fleischman 1995: 2). Notwithstanding the difficulties in giving a precise definition of modality, there still seems to be a consistent agreement on "the fundamental features commonly subsumed under it" (Varga 2016: 25).

When it comes to its definition, modality[1] is a linguistic category relating to "the status of the proposition that describes [an] event" (Palmer 2001: 1), or as Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 173) put it, it is a phenomenon "centrally concerned with the speaker's attitude towards the factuality or actualization of the situation expressed by the rest of the clause," typically by the main verb in the clause (Kalogjera 1982: 1). In simple terms, modality is a linguistic category that expresses "the speaker's attitude or opinion regarding the contents of the sentence or what the sentence proposition entails" (Palmer, 1986: 21, see also Lyons 1977: 452). By "attitude,"

[1] A few remarks should be made on the distinction between modality and the closely related linguistic category of mood. Even though some scholars use the term "mood" in the same sense as modality, most argue that the two are strictly separate concepts (Zhang 2019: 879). Mood refers to the inflectional system of a verb, representing the grammaticalization of modality within the verbal system (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 186). In other words, it refers to the morphological means of expressing modality and is therefore a category of grammar. It encompasses a set of distinctive grammatical forms used to signal modality (Zhang 2019: 879), whereas modality represents a category of meaning (Huddleston & Pullun 2002: 186) that takes the aforementioned morphological forms.

Givón (1993: 169) means primarily two types of the speaker's judgment concerning "the propositional information exposed in the clause":

- "epistemic judgments of truth, probability, certainty, belief or evidence" and
- "evaluative judgments of desirability, preference, intent, ability, obligation or manipulation."

The above suggests that modality is characterized not by some objectively existing reality but by a subjectively expressed attitude toward that same reality. By way of illustration, consider examples (1–3).

1) *He **is** the culprit.*
2) *He **must** be the culprit.*
3) *He **might** be the culprit.*

The first example is an ordinary declarative sentence, pertaining to the realm of factuality, that is, objectively expressed reality. It is a descriptive sentence that describes a reality, referring to a state of affairs; therefore, it represents a proposition that can be used in statements. Everything representable in terms of propositions is a matter of fact; that is, it can be known and consequently negated using "it is not true that" (Kiefer 1987: 73). The preceding statement does not apply to the second and third sentences, in which the speaker interferes in the statement by expressing their imperfect judgments, shifting it from the spectrum of factuality to that of subjective speculation, i.e., from an objectively stated proposition to an utterance grounded merely on their point of view. These are non-descriptive sentences whose content cannot be known "in the same way as propositions can be known" (Kiefer 1987: 74). Consequently, they cannot be used as a statement about reality and are therefore not subject to negation (Kiefer 1987: 74): **It is not true that he might be the culprit*. In these circumstances, the second and third sentences could be given the following interpretations: *I have deduced from the evidence that he is the culprit* and *I think it is likely that he is the culprit,* respectively. According to Depraetere and Reed (2006: 269), the feature of nonfactuality is what is common to all modal utterances. Given that such sentences have to do with the speaker's uncertain beliefs, one may get the strong impression that they are somewhat weaker and more tentative, requiring further verification. Put simply, declarative sentences without modals (or other linguistic hedges such as *I think*, *possibly*, etc.) have this straightforward objective power and show the "definite meaning

of a proposition" (Zhang 2019: 879), whereas modal constructions do not.

A concept that may further bring us closer to the elucidation of the phenomenon of modality is polarity. As maintained by Halliday and Matthiessen (2014: 172), polarity represents a choice between positive and negative, as in *it is*/*it isn't*, *do it*/*don't do it*. Since, however, the possibilities are not exhausted in a choice between *yes* and *no*, there are also intermediate degrees between the two poles, like *sometimes* or *maybe*. These intermediate degrees represent modality (Halliday & Matthiessen 2014: 176). When it comes to their boundaries, the literature generally agrees that modal meanings extend across an area delimited by the force of necessity as one pole and the force of possibility as the other, as "necessity and possibility are the central notions of modal logic" (Lyons 1977: 787). In both the epistemic and deontic domains (two of the most prominent modal domains [Bybee & Fleischman 1995: 4]), various modal propositions and their associated modal meanings can be analyzed within the framework of those two semantic dimensions, as will be discussed in detail in the following sections.

2.2. *Modal meanings*

Modality has traditionally been classified as a semantic category (Varga 2016: 28). While syntax and morphology differ cross-linguistically, the semantic approach to modality allows for a more encompassing framework within which modality can be studied, since some basic modal meanings will still be common cross-linguistically (Narrog 2005, as cited in Varga 2016: 28). Nonetheless, this broader and more universal framework does not facilitate the task of dividing modal categories precisely. Depending on the approach and theoretical view, as well as the intrinsic features of particular languages and their linguistic apparatus, different authors identify and define modal meanings in distinct fashions, which, as Werkmann Horvat (2023: 64) observes, leads to myriad problems in their classification, with no consensus on how to pin down, classify, and delimit different modal meanings. Considering that the emphasis in the current paper's analysis will be placed on shifts in modal strength and means of expressing modality and not on modal flavors[2] (since any shift in the type of modality would mean bad translation), I will only address the most general classification of modal flavors.

[2] The term is taken from Portner (2009). It is also used in Bhatt (1999), von Fintel & Helm (2002), von Fintel & Gillies (2007), Hacquard (2006), Rubinstein (2012), Kratzer (2012). It stands for modal meanings or types of modality.

In this light, special emphasis has been placed on the subdivision of modality into epistemic and non-epistemic dimensions. Most of the traditional approaches to modal meanings suggest that this is the most relevant modal dichotomy (Werkmann Horvat 2021: 119). Epistemic modality concerns the possibility or necessity of the factualness of a proposition, thus relying on one's judgment based on knowledge and beliefs (Lyons, 1977: 793) about the world, as well as "how that information changes as we share what we know" (von Fintel & Gillies 2007: 59). In other words, epistemic modality refers to how certain the speaker is about state of affairs being judged (Kiefer 1987:67). Take a look at the following example.

(4) *He **may** have been at the game.*

In this sentence, the speaker makes an assumption based on prior knowledge, experience, or belief about the behavior of the individual referred to or other specific conditions that lead them to the conclusion that this person attended the game. As can be seen, epistemic modality relates to the assessment of the facticity of a state or event.

With regard to non-epistemic types of modality, there is significant variation throughout the literature regarding their classification. Nevertheless, the category of deontic modality seems to figure most prominently in this part of modality. This dimension relates to the conveyance of what is possible or necessary with regard to courses of action that are conditioned by some obligation or compulsion (Lyons 1977). This type of modality concerns the desirability of actions rather than the plausibility of propositions (von Wright 1951: 1–2) and is therefore associated with the speaker's assessment of the actuality of a state of affairs in terms of social, moral, or legal norms (Palmer 2001: 70). In Lyons's (1977: 823) words, deontic modality has to do with "the necessity or possibility of acts performed by morally responsible agents," as shown in the following examples (Lyons 1977: 832).

(5) *You **may** open the door.*

(6) *You **must** open the door.*

Deontic modality differs from epistemic modality not only in the status of propositions but also in the fact that it is typically based on a certain authority (Palmer 2001: 70) that assesses the degree of desirability or necessity of the action to be taken and lays down the rules to be followed in the case (Knežević & Brdar 2011: 121). Unlike epistemic modality, which reflects how the speaker perceives world affairs based on their internal cognitive abilities, deontic

modality has to do with aspects external to the speaker, such as norms, conventions, legislation, etc., reflecting how world affairs should be according to these aspects (Matković 2022: 4). However, it remains inextricably linked to all sorts of social knowledge, involving "the speaker's belief systems about morality and legality and their estimations of power and authority" (Saeed 1997: 137).

In English, there is a case of polysemy that reflects the difference between these two flavors (epistemic and deontic). By way of illustration, the modal verb *may* can be used deontically to express permission (7) but also epistemically to express possibility (8) (Bybee & Fleischman 1995: 5).

(7) *You **may** come in now.*

(8) *That **may** be the mailman at the door.*

Traditionally, there is another semantic dimension that is often mentioned in addition to these two types of modality, even though some may consider it somewhat peripheral to the concept of modality (Huddleston & Pullum 2005: 55), namely dynamic modality. It may occasionally be mistaken for epistemic or deontic modality, but the difference lies in that it expresses one's abilities and dispositions and not his attitude toward the truth of propositions or what is required or permitted (Huddleston and Pullum 2005: 54–55). Likewise, Gisborne (2007: 52) asserts that this modal flavor is non-subjective and that its meaning is neither contextual nor temporally bound to the speech event. On these grounds, some scholars argue in favor of its marginal status regarding modal classification. However, this position could be viewed as unorthodox since most of the formal literature agrees that dynamic modality is a full-fledged modal category. An example of this type of modality can be seen as follows:

(9) *She **can** speak five languages.* (Huddleston & Pullum 2005: 55)

Paraphrased as *She is able to speak five languages*, the sentence manifests a person's objective ability independent of one's subjective point of view, while "subjectivity is an essential feature of modality" (Palmer 1990: 206). Dynamic modality is typically expressed by the modal verb *can*, which may lead to cases of ambiguity between a dynamic and either an epistemic or deontic interpretation (Huddleston & Pullum 2005: 55). Notice, incidentally, that this fact at the same time serves as a rebuttal to Gisborne's point about the non-contextuality of dynamic propositions; see examples (10–11).

(10) *You **can't** be serious*. (epistemic or dynamic)

(11) *She **can** drive*. (deontic or dynamic)

For the purposes of the present thesis, I will assume that there are sufficiently clear structural criteria to warrant the claim that dynamic modality classifies as a core modal flavor.

In sum, there are at least three basic modal flavors that make up the core semantic domains of modality: epistemic, deontic, and dynamic. For the purposes of this paper, I have decided to follow Portner's (2018) classification, which subsumes deontic modality under the label of "priority modality." By introducing this notion, the author dissects the basic meaning of deontic modality, layering it into three separate flavors: 1) deontic modality in the narrow sense, concerning what is possible or necessary given a body of rules; 2) bouletic modality, relating to what is possible or necessary given one's desires; and 3) teleological, having to do with what is possible or necessary given a particular goal. All these priority categories may be subsumed under what is labeled deontic modality in the traditional classification. From this point onwards, therefore, I will refer to those two types of modality (deontic and priority) interchangeably. As far as dynamic modality is concerned, Portner (2018: 11) asserts that it has to do with "the possible courses of events in the world, based on the factual circumstances." The author divides it into subordinate groupings that comprise: 1) volitional modals, which concern "the actions available to a volitional individual" (2018: 11) and include ability modality (focus on the individual's abilities), opportunity modality (focus on the circumstances surrounding the individual), and dispositional modality (focus on the individual's dispositions); 2) intrinsic modals (having to do with the possible courses of events not tied to a volitional individual); and 3) quantificational modals (existential and universal), which involve quantification over individuals. Epistemic modality has been retained by the author as it is in the traditional classification.

Each of the aforementioned flavors can be expressed with varying degrees of conviction. For instance, the main difference between priority *should* and *must* lies in the level of necessity/obligation they convey, as *should* indicates actions that are less binding than those expressed by *must*. Accordingly, despite their modal force being identical (*necessity*), there are subtle shades of meaning that separate them in terms of modal strength. In order to give a definition of modal strength and describe the previously mentioned modal flavors in terms of

modal strength, the subject of modal scalarity needs to be addressed. This step will be of utmost importance for the analysis.

2.3. *Grades of modal meanings*

Modal verbs can be divided into verbs that convey necessity or possibility, which are the types of modal force. In the realm of these two semantic dimensions, there are varying degrees to which those dimensions are expressed. This is referred to as modal strength. Put another way, modal force is reflected in the subordinate category of modal strength (Werkmann Horvat 2023: 60), which implies the force of "commitment to the truth" (Bybee & Fleischman 1995: 4) or actualization of a proposition (Huddleston & Pullum 2005: 55). To illustrate the previous point, the modal verbs *should* and *must* are both considered necessity modals, but the speaker will often feel that the former is somewhat weaker than the latter (Rubinstein 2012; Von Fintel & Iatridou 2008). Therefore, as mentioned in the previous section, despite their type of quantification being the same (*necessity*), there is a difference in the degree of their force (*weak necessity* versus *strong necessity*).

With respect to determining the place that a particular verb occupies on a modal scale, the notion of scalar quantity implicature may be helpful. First introduced by Horn (1972), it relates to the claim that modal verbs behave similarly to other language items, causing scalar implicatures, where items positioned higher on a scale imply the veracity of those subordinate to them (Werkmann Horvat 2023: 60). In the majority of cases, this concept will enable one to hone in on the semantic nuances of different modals. Consider the following examples from von Fintel and Iatridou (2008: 117), where a difference between degrees of necessity/obligation can be observed:

(10) ***You ***must*** do the dishes, but you don't have to*.

(11) *You **ought to** do the dishes, but you don't have to*.

It is evident that example (10) is unacceptable because a stronger modal verb (*must*), viz., a verb that takes a higher position on the deontic scale, implicates what is expressed by a weaker modal verb (*have to*), rendering the latter verb illogical and redundant. Therefore, a stronger verb coming in a sentence before a weaker one is unacceptable. This accords with Grice's first maxim of quantity: "Make your contribution as informative as is required (for the current purposes of

the exchange)" (Grice 1975: 45). In example (11), *ought to*, as the weaker of the two modal verbs in the sentence, does not imply the message conveyed by the stronger verb *have to*, leaving space for it to be further expressed.

2.3.1. Epistemic modal scale

Epistemic modality ranges in strength "depending on the degree of commitment to the proposition the speaker wishes to express" (Verstraete 2005: 9) from logical possibility to logical necessity. The former is the weakest degree, while the latter is the strongest. Situated between the two extremes are probability and predictability as the intermediate degrees (Verstraete 2005: 14). This strength assessment "varies along the lines of the subjective interpretation of the extra-linguistic reality" (Kačmárová 2011: 31).

Starting from the strongest modals (*must* and *will*), there is disagreement over which of the two is the strongest modal verb on the epistemic scale. Joos (1964: 195) contends that *must* makes "the strongest possible assertion in favour of the occurrence," whereas Lakoff (1972: 243) claims that in classifying the "epistemic modals in a hierarchy of ascending certainty" *will* comes out at the top, as it is "the modal of choice when the speaker believes the event described in the sentence to be virtually certain of occurrence." However, since *will* is closely related to the concept of futurity (Zandvoort 1975: 76) (along with its semantic counterpart *shall*) and might therefore be considered peripheral to the notion of modality, I will give priority in this regard to the verb *must*, which expresses necessity (logical necessity = certainty). Next in line are verbs with related meanings: *ought to* and *should*. Some assert that these two verbs are interchangeable (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 186), whereas others argue that *ought to* is more formal and consequently stronger. In any case, both of these verbs are weaker than *must* and may be referred to as denoting "weakened logical necessity" (Leech 2004: para. 101), viz., probability (Hoye 1997: 240). Situated at the lowest points of the epistemic scale are the verbs *may* and *can*, along with their past-reference counterparts *might* and *could*, respectively. They denote mere possibility. There is no consensus on which of the two possesses the greater strength in this case either. There are some assumptions, however. One of those rests on the assertion that *may* represents "factual possibility," whereas *can* stands for "theoretical possibility" (Leech 2004: para. 121). This difference is clarified by the following sets of equivalent statements:

(10) *The road **may** be blocked* = "*It is possible that the road is blocked*" (factual)

(11) *The road **can** be blocked* = "*It is possible for the road to be blocked*" (theoretical)

As can be seen, *may* is paraphrased as *It is possible* followed by a *that*-clause, whereas *can* is paraphrased as *It is possible* accompanied by "a (*for* + Noun Phrase +) *to* + Infinitive construction" (Leech 2004: para. 121). The second sentence conveys a theoretically conceivable event, whereas the first one may be perceived as more immediate because the actual likelihood of a situation's happening is being considered (Leech 2004: para. 121). On these grounds, one may conclude that *may* is the stronger verb. However, some may view this postulate as unconventional. Whatever their relative positions are, the pertinent literature supports the claim that both verbs come out at the bottom of the epistemic scale (Lakoff 1972: 243). Based on the above considerations, the English epistemic modal verbs can be classified as follows:

Table 1. Overview of the English epistemic modal verbs: semantics and strength.

Modal force	Modal meaning	Modal verb	Certainty
necessity	logical necessity	must	**high certainty** ↓ **uncertainty**
	predictability	will/shall	
		would	
	probability	ought (to)	
		should	
possibility	possibility	can/may	
		could/might	

2.3.2. Deontic modal scale

Deontic modality also varies in strength, forming a scale (Horn 1972: 124–127) that (partially) corresponds to the aforementioned degrees of epistemic strength. The weakest degree is permission, paralleling epistemic possibility. On the opposite side of the scale is obligation, taken as the strongest degree, matching epistemic necessity. Between the two poles, there are various intermediate degrees, such as suggestions or advisability, denoting the desirability of actions (Verstraete 2005: 14). Saeed (2003: 136) places these intermediate degrees within the boundaries

of the obligation category; they fall under the heading of "weak obligation." They form a zero point relative to which the two extreme values form the positive and negative poles (Verstraete 2005: 35).

The parallelism between the epistemic and deontic domains may be the factor that has given rise to the assumption that the two have the same scalar organization and consequently the same scalarity effects (Verstraete 2005: 15). Nonetheless, contrary to what the literature has traditionally assumed, scalar quantity implicatures may not work across the modal domain as a whole, posing a specific problem for the scalar implicature mechanism (Verstraete 2005: 2). Expressions of deontic permission and obligation do not only express commitment on the part of the authority figure, but they also "carry different presuppositions about the willingness of the modal agent (...) to carry out the action in question" (Verstraete 2005: 2), thereby cross-cutting "the parameter of informativeness or strength (...) by other properties relating to presupposed attitudes of the modal agent" (Verstraete 2005: 5). Such disruption of the implicature mechanism results in a layering that does not allow for the perfect scale to be formed, consequently making pinpointing the exact positions of deontic modals somewhat of a more demanding challenge than is the case with their epistemic counterparts. The modal verb *shall* serves as a prime example of this: it indicates strong necessity (obligation) but also lower degrees of commitment, such as advisability and volition, thus appearing multiple times across different points on the scale.

In descending order of strength, the modal verb *must*[3] occupies the top of the scale as it emphasizes "the speaker's authority over the audience" (Liping 2017: 200) and places a requirement on the addressee (Knežević & Brdar 2011: 140). In the same rank is *shall*, which also expresses strong necessity, as mentioned earlier. There are conflicting views on which of these two modal verbs is stronger. Whitlock Howe (1975: 17) asserts that "both show 'necessity' for the event to happen," with *must* being "much stronger," whereas Palmer (1995: 62) claims that *shall* is stronger than *must* in that "it does not merely lay an obligation, however strong, but actually guarantees that the action will occur." Be that as it may, there is generally no dispute that they are at the top of the scale. Given its close semantic relationship with *shall*, *will* may also be

[3] Modal verbs of any strength can be subject to "pragmatic strengthening or weakening" (Verhulst et al. 2012). For example, even though *must* primarily expresses strong necessity, it can occasionally be pragmatically weakened: *You must try this cake, it's delicious.* Similarly, the weak necessity modal *should* can be used to express stronger necessity meanings: *To apply for this card*, *applications should be made to the Director of Recreation* (Verhulst et al. 2012: 12).

counted as a strong necessity modal. Next in line are the verbs *ought to* and *should*, which are classified as the intermediate degrees of the scale. They are weaker than *must* because this verb is based on a set of rules backed up by severe consequences (Portner 2009: 190) and "does not allow for the event referred to not to take place" (Palmer 1990), whereas [*ought to*] and *should* pertain to rules that one can violate without producing any terrible outcome (Portner 2009: 190). They derive from weak deonticity (Traugott & Dasher 2002: 106), covering meanings such as "weaker" moral obligation, duty, sensible action, advisability, and suggestions (Palmer 1990: 123). There is no consensus on their semantic profile as they have been defined in contradictory ways; even though they "seem to be largely interchangeable" (Huddleston & Pullum 2002: 186), Declerck (1991: 377) claims that *ought to* is more objective than *should.* Along similar lines, Cruse (2004: 299–300) considers *ought to* superior in strength to *should*. By contrast, Sweetser (1990: 53) considers it to be weaker. These discrepancies might be a consequence of explaining modality in terms of "intuitive strength" (Verhulst et al. 2012: 13). For example, Westney (1995: 168) asserts, without offering conclusive proof, that *ought to* is "inherently stronger" than *should*, whereas Sweetser (1990: 53) puts forward the opposite without providing clear-cut evidence for the view. Further work is certainly required to disentangle these complexities. In any case, these two are followed by volitional s*hall* (Hermeren: 1978), while the lowest points on the deontic scale are occupied by *can* and *may*, along with their perfective counterparts, *could* and *might*, respectively. They indicate mere permission (Saeed 2003: 136). Given the above, the English deontic modal verbs can be classified in the following fashion:

Table 2. Overview of the English deontic modal verbs: semantics and strength.

Modal force	**Modal meaning**	**Modal verb**	
necessity	strong obligation	must, shall, will	**obligation** ↓ **permission**
	weak obligation, advice, suggestion	ought to, should, shall	
	volition	shall	
possibility	permission	can/may, could/might	

As can be seen above, the description of the modal degrees provided here is confined to modal verbs. It should be noted that modal verbs are not the exclusive means of determining those

degrees. They can be described by employing other word classes, such as adverbs or adjectives. However, due to limited space, I have decided to confine my description of modality to modal verbs, which is, as Werkmann Horvat (2023: 54–55) points out, a common approach throughout the literature in general. In the following section, a brief account of their general characteristics with an emphasis on their morphosyntactic features will be given.

2.4. *English modal verbs*

The classification of English modal verbs may differ slightly across the literature. According to Biber et al. (1999: 73), there are nine central modal auxiliaries: *can*, *could*, *may*, *might*, *shall*, *should*, *will*, and *would*. They are central in that they fully meet the criteria set for the classification of modal verbs, therefore being labeled "core modals" (Carter & McCarthy 2006: 638). In addition, there are marginal modals: *ought to*, *dare*, *need*, and *used to* (Quirk et al. 1985: 138). They are on the borderline between modal auxiliaries and lexical verbs because they lack some of the parameters that constitute the modal criteria. Some scholars call them semi-modals or quasi-modals (Biber et al. 1999: 73). However, authors such as Greenbaum (1996: 246) and Quirk et al. (1985: 137) only state that they are peripheral and do not classify them as semi-auxiliaries, under the heading of which come expressions such as *had better* and *had got to*.

The modal criteria are based mainly on morphosyntactic grounds. For instance, modals differ from lexical verbs in that they can only occur in finite functions (Quirk et al. 1985: 127). Furthermore, they lack secondary inflectional forms and hence cannot appear in constructions that require one, including the *to*-infinitival (12) and bare infinitival (13) constructions, the imperative (14), the gerund-participle (15), and the past-participle (16) (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 106):

(12) **I'd like to **can** swim.*

(13) **I will **can** swim soon.*

(14) ****Can** swim by June!*

(15) **I regret not **canning** swim.*

(16) **I have **could** swim for six years.*

The absence of non-finite forms restricts them to the initial position of the verb phrase (Quirk et al. 1985: 128):

(17) *You **may** come tomorrow.*

(18) **You come **may** tomorrow.*

Since they are auxiliary verbs, they do not need to correspond to the subject in plural agreement and are therefore devoid of the –s ending in the 3rd person singular present tense (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 107):

(19) *He **may** not go.*

(20) **He **mays** not go.*

In standard dialects of English, modal verbs cannot co-occur within a single verb phrase, except in some regional dialects that allow modals in series (such as *might could* or *might should*) (Biber et al. 1999: 483):

(21) **You **must can**.*

They take exclusively bare infinitival complements and no other kind of complement (Huddleston and Pullum 2002: 107):

(22) *They **must** work.*

(23) **They **must** to work.*

(24) **They **must** working.*

Based on the above considerations, one will notice that modal verbs are limited in the number of forms they can take (Werkmann Horvat 2021: 28). Consequently, they are often spoken of as "morphologically defective" elements (Palmer 1965; see further Huddleston 1976).

Now that I have briefly described modality in English, it is necessary to proceed with a description of the Croatian modal system. Emphasis will be on the degrees of strength of the Croatian modal verbs and their relationship with their English counterparts.

2.5. *Modality in Croatian*

2.5.1. Croatian modal verbs

Due to the diversity of approaches to modality as well as the limited amount of research in this field, it has not been fully defined what verbs can be considered core modals in the Croatian language (Werkmann Horvat 2023: 56). Knežević and Brdar (2011: 119) claim that the "fully-fledged" modal verbs in Croatian are *moći* ('may'), *morati* ('must'), *trebati* ('need'), and *valjati* ('ought to'). These verbs have been determined along the axis of their polyfunctionality; each can express at least two modal flavors (Hansen 2007: 34): *moći* (deontic: permission and epistemic: probability), *morati* (deontic: obligation/necessity and epistemic: probability), *trebati* (deontic: obligation/necessity and epistemic: probability), *valjati* (deontic: obligation/necessity and epistemic: assumption) (Knežević & Brdar 2011: 19). Werkmann Horvat (2021) supports the aforementioned division, but with one difference: due to its archaic nature, increasingly rare usage in the language, and semantic similarity to the modal verb *trebati* ('ought to', 'should'), the author removes the modal verb *valjati* ('ought to') from the division, adding to it the verb *smjeti* ('may', 'be allowed to'). In response to the claim that *smjeti* is a semi-modal verb for its lack of polyfunctionality and scope limitation to deontic modality (Knežević & Brdar 2011: 119), Werkmann Horvat (2023: 56–57) asserts that semantic multifacetedness is a common but by no means obligatory modal verb feature. For example, the verb *might* is limited to a single flavor, yet the literature is in complete agreement that it is a core modal verb. The same holds true for *smjeti*, in support of which verifiable syntactic evidence has been submitted: among other things, it combines with inanimate subjects and is subject to passivization (Hansen 2005). According to Werkmann Horvat (2021: 117), the central Croatian modal verbs can be divided as follows:

Table 3. Overview of the Croatian core modal verbs.

Modal verb	English translation	Modal force
morati	must, have to	necessity
trebati	ought to, should	
smjeti	be allowed to, may	possibility
moći	may, can	

In the pertinent literature, there are some further candidates for inclusion in the core modal category. Badurina (2020) puts forward *htjeti* ('want') as a primary modal *sensu stricto*.

However, this verb is not considered a core modal in the foreign literature because of its marginality within the framework of modal meanings (Werkmann Horvat 2023: 57). Moreover, some scholars, such as van der Auwera and Plungian (1998), completely exclude volition from modal classification. In a broader sense, according to Badurina (2020: 52; see also Silić & Pranjković 2007: 186), there are potentially an infinite number of verbs that may have a modal function: verbs of speaking, thinking, feeling, perceiving, and willing, to name a few. The difference, as the author points out (2020: 52–53), is that the aforementioned verb types, in addition to their modal usage, can also occur in their primary function as lexical verbs.[4]

Grammatically speaking, the Croatian modal verbs are not subject to tense constraints, that is, they can change in form to make different tenses (Badurina 2020: 53). In addition, they can be used in conditional sentences to express an uncertain or mitigated statement (Barić et al. 1997: 418), whereas their imperative usage is rare and unconventional (Badurina 2020: 53). At the syntactic level, it is important to recall that modal verbs cannot function as separate predicates but must be paired with a content verb, which is most often in the infinitive form: **On mora* vs. *On mora otputovati* (**He must* vs. *He must depart*) (Badurina 2020: 53). In Croatian, modal verbs carry morphological information about verb tense, number, person, and gender—in contrast to English modal verbs, which rarely change form (Werkmann Horvat 2023: 55). Furthermore, Croatian allows combining two full-fledged modals within a single verb phrase (*On* ***treba moći*** *doći kad on želi*), which is referred to as "layered modality" (Werkmann Horvat (2021). In English, combining two modal verbs is generally unacceptable. Instead, modal verbs can only take modal adverbs or semi-modal verbs (Werkmann Horvat 2021: 1–2).

The claim that modal force is one of the central determinants of modality (Werkmann Horvat 2023: 59) also applies to Croatian, and by the same token, the Croatian modals can be divided into groupings that express the aforementioned two types of modal force: necessity (Cro. *nužnost*) and possibility (Cro. *mogućnost*). *Morati* ('must') and *trebati* ('ought to') express

[4] Semantically, *trebati* is a prototypical modal verb, but it is also used as a lexical verb (Badurina 2020: 52). As a modal verb, it relates to the execution of externally-oriented actions indicated by infinitive complements (Belaj & Tanacković Faletar 2017: 26), in which case it serves as a non-content element that forms a complex predicate along with a lexical verb, as in *Luka treba kupiti kruh* ('Luka should buy bread') (Nazalević Čučević & Belaj 2018: 191). It is a lexical verb when it carries content and combines with noun complements that function as direct objects, as in *Luka treba kruh* ('Luka needs bread') (Nazalević Čučević & Belaj 2018: 191). Considering these different uses, Badurina (2020: 52) asserts that these are two distinct verbs. Their translation equivalents (*ought to*/*should* and *to need*) testify in support of the previous claim.

necessity, whereas *smjeti* (‘may’) and *moći* (‘may’, ‘can’) convey possibility. Within the framework of the modal forces, there are different degrees of their modal strength, as will be discussed in the following section.

2.5.2. Modal strength of the Croatian modals (and their English equivalents)

Given that this paper analyzes shifts in the strength of modal verbs (along with those in the means of expressing modality), it is necessary to determine the equivalent degrees of strength of the Croatian modals and their English counterparts, i.e., the translation equivalents in relation to which the shifts will be reflected. Due to the complexity of such an assessment, other modal expressions (such as adverbs, adjectives, particles, etc.), which I will not tackle in this section, will be dealt with separately in the analysis section.

Firstly, it is necessary to describe the strength of the Croatian modal verbs in more detail. Kalogjera (1982) proposes the following grouping in descending order of strength: *morati* (‘must’) – *trebati* (‘need’) – *valjati* (‘ought to’) – *moći* (‘may’, ‘can’). Considering that, for the reasons mentioned in the previous section, the verb *valjati* has been excluded and *smjeti* has taken its place, the question arises as to whether *smjeti* is stronger than the verb *moći*. The strength of modal verbs, as outlined in Section 2.3., can be assessed by applying scalar tests. The application of such a test, however, in the case of these two modal verbs of possibility is interesting because it yields results that run counter to native speakers’ intuition about the two verbs, as shown in the following examples (Werkmann Horvat 2023: 60).

(25) ?***Možeš*** *to napraviti*, *ustvari*, ***smiješ***. (*You can/may do it. In fact*, y*ou are allowed to do it*.)

(26) ?***Smiješ*** *to napraviti*, *ustvari*, ***možeš.*** (*You are allowed to do it. In fact, you can/may do it*.)

These two examples show marginal or unacceptable sentences where it is difficult to discern the relative strength relationship between the two verbs—a result that is inconsistent with the intuition of native speakers, according to whom *smjeti* is stronger than *moći*. Such intuition probably stems from the sense of authority carried by the modal verb *smjeti*, which relies on rules and possible consequences, while *moći* expresses a weaker priority meaning, leaving more

choices available (Werkmann Horvat 2023: 60–61). It may strike one as intriguing that in the Croatian language, as shown by the example of these two verbs, there are varying degrees of modal strength within the scope of *possibility*, which is not the case with English (Werkmann Horvat 2023: 61). When it comes to the strongest scalar position, Jonke (1964: 397–398) claims that *morati* ('must') tops the scale, followed by *trebati* ('ought to', 'should'), which expresses a lower degree of necessity. *Morati* in the present tense conveys strong obligation, while the conditional tense is associated with advisability (Knežević & Brdar 2011: 119). In Knežević & Brdar (2011: 119), the English equivalent of *trebati* is the semi-modal verb *need*, while *valjati* is associated with the verbs *ought to* and *should*. The exclusion of *valjati* and the semantic closeness between *ought to*/*should* and *trebati* (Werkmann Horvat 2021: 46) have cleared the way for those two verbs to take over the meaning of *trebati*, previously reserved for the verb *need*. Based on the above considerations, the strengths of the Croatian modal verbs and their English equivalents can be set as in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 4. Overview of the Croatian epistemic modals and their English equivalents.

Modal force	**Modal verb**	**English equivalent**	
necessity	morati (with *da*-construction)	must	**necessity** ↓ **possibility**
	trebati	ought to, should	
possibility	smjeti	-	
	moći	may, can might, could	

Table 5. Overview of the Croatian deontic modals and their English equivalents.

Modal force	**Modal verb**	**English equivalent**	
necessity	morati	must	**obligation** ↓ **permission**
	trebati	ought to, should	
possibility	smjeti	may	
	moći	may, can	

As can be seen, the modal verbs *shall* and *will* are missing from the tables. The reason is that they do not have direct modal equivalents in the Croatian language but are usually translated by future tense forms. For this reason, they have been excluded from the analysis.

2.6. *The current study*

There has not been much research on the translation of modal verbs between English and Croatian. In this regard, the study conducted by Knežević and Brdar (2011) figures most prominently, in which the authors investigate the translation of four Croatian modal verbs (*morati*, *trebati*, *valjati*, *moći*) into English in legal texts. Their analysis combines quantitative and qualitative judgments in an attempt to capture the translatability of the aforementioned modals into English and to describe shifts that occur in translation. What makes their study different from the present one is the source language, which is Croatian, whereas English is the target language. Furthermore, their analysis covers exclusively the priority (deontic) spectrum of modality, where the authors investigate the translation of legal texts. With regard to studies on the translation of modal verbs in literary texts between English and Croatian, no such studies, to the best of my knowledge, have been conducted up to the writing of the current thesis. Consequently, there is a lack of contrastive analysis of the two genres (legal and literary) regarding the translation of modal verbs exclusively.

This paper aims to capture the general characteristics of translating English modal verbs into Croatian in legal and literary texts by comparing and contrasting the similarities and differences between the two genres. Shifts in modality that occur in the translation process serve as the foundation for the analysis. These will be interpreted taking into account syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic aspects, and in this way, I will try to detect possible patterns that occur in the translation process at a more general level. The types of shifts that will be examined are shifts in the strength of modal verbs and those in the means of expressing modality. As for the former, it was necessary to determine the degrees of strength of the Croatian modal verbs and those of their English counterparts (see Section 2.5.2). Any deviation from what has been established will be treated as a shift in modal strength. It is important to note that the tables of the modal equivalents from the previous section are limited to modal verbs. Modality can also be expressed by other grammatical means, such as adverbs, particles, modal expressions, etc. For example, epistemic *must* can be translated as *sigurno* (‘surely’), producing a shift in the means of

expressing modality (modal verb → adverb) but not one in strength because the adverb in question expresses a high degree of certainty and could be considered equivalent to the verb *must* in terms of modal strength. Therefore, what is meant by a shift in the means of expressing modality is the translation of a modal verb into any part of speech or grammatical construction except another modal verb. These two kinds of shifts will be tackled in the following sections.

3. Methodology

The corpus used for the analysis comprises a total of 520 source text sample sentences containing the following four modal verbs: *must*, *should*, *ought to*, and *may*[5]. The same number of their translations into Croatian were collected. Each of the four modal verbs was analyzed within two genres of translation: legal and literary. The analysis of each genre included a total of 65 examples per modal verb. The English sentences and their translations into Croatian were compiled from two different types of sources, one of which was the electronic online corpus manager *Sketch Engine*. On *Sketch Engine*, the corpus used for collecting the sentences was *EUR-Lex 2/2016*. It is a corpus that contains excerpts from the official legal texts of the European Union. It was searched using the option of parallel concordance, where the results coming up in English were displayed together with their corresponding segments translated into Croatian. I used the option *Good Examples*. This option is a system that evaluates sentences and displays those that may serve as dictionary examples or examples suitable for teaching purposes. The number of rows containing sentences was set to 500 per page. The sentences were randomly selected as I scrolled down the page. The literary corpus comprises sentences extracted from two literary works written by J.K. Rowling: *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix* (2003) and *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince* (2005), and their translations into Croatian done by Dubravka Petrović: *Harry Potter i Red feniksa* i *Harry Potter i Princ miješane krvi*. The literary works are referred to in the analysis section as follows: "OoF" stands for *Harry Potter and the Order of the Phoenix*, and "HBP" stands for *Harry Potter and the Half-Blood Prince*. The modal items were extracted from the literary works using the *Control Find* option, which is a keyboard shortcut used to search for text within a written document. The translations of the source language sentences were searched manually in the target language texts.

The first part of the analysis was quantitative, examining modal shifts occurring in the translations. I also examined the syntactic properties of the modal verbs and their semantic profile, i.e., the meanings they express. The qualitative analysis involved further elucidation and a discussion of the findings of the quantitative analysis. The translation choices were explained

[5] I have chosen these four modals for their centrality to the notion of modality. Even though some scholars argue that *ought to* is a semi-modal verb, it lacks only one modal criterion (taking the infinitive 'to' before the main verb), allowing me to include it in the current analysis. The modal verb *can* was excluded from the analysis in the course of the research process as it was impossible to analyze it thoroughly because of the already extensive scope of the thesis.

by taking into account syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic factors. In this part of the thesis, the characteristics of each modal verb and the context in which it appeared in the source language text were described, expounding the factors causing the aforementioned shifts in modality. These shifts served as the core idea around which the finding of the general characteristics of the two genres of translation was supposed to revolve.

This study aims to investigate the general features of modal verbs in legal and literary texts and find out how those features affect the translation process. I aim to find out whether there are any specific characteristics regarding modal verbs in each of the two genres of translation and what motivates those characteristics. This study also examines the similarities and differences between the two genres regarding modality on a more general level.

4. Analysis

4.1. *Findings of the quantitative analysis*

4.1.1. Must – legal corpus

The analysis of 65 randomly selected sentences containing the modal verb *must* that I extracted from the legal corpus revealed that all modal items in those sentences carried a priority flavor. Table 6 shows the translation solutions employed to translate the modal verb *must* in the legal corpus.

Table 6. *Must* – ST[6] meanings and TT[7] translation solutions: legal corpus.

	mod. vb.			**M.O.[8]**	**lex. vb.**	**mod. expr.**		**N.M.[9]**	**adj.**
	morati	trebati	moći	ind.[10]	valjati	biti potrebno	biti dužan		potrebne
must	48	5	1	5	2	1	1	1	1
prior.	48	5	1	5	2	1	1	1	1

Shifts in the strength of this modal verb were observed in 15.38% of the cases. The analysis revealed that those from strong obligation (*must*) to weak obligation (*trebati, valjati, biti potrebno, potrebne*[11]) led the way, accounting for 90% of the total shifts in modal strength. The second most common grouping, making up 10% of the cases, involved shifting from strong obligation to permission (*moći*).

Shifts in the means of expressing modality occurred in 16.92% of the cases, 45.45% of which involved omission of the modal verb. The modal verb was rendered by a lexical verb in 18.18% of the cases, and the same percentage involved translating the modal verb by a modal

[6] Source text.
[7] Target text.
[8] M.O. "modal verb omitted"- used for examples in which the modal verb has been removed before the lexical verb in the target text without any other significant structural changes.
[9] N.M. "non-modal translation" - used for examples in which not only the modal verb has been omitted in the target text but also the modal meaning from the ST sentence has been lost due to significant structural changes in the target text.
[10] Indicative.
[11] Even though these are different from modal verbs in terms of word class and thus not eligible for being classified as a shift in modal strength, they are marked as shifts because it is completely obvious that they indicate a decrease in modal strength. For instance, *biti potrebno* is a modal expression that is closely semantically related to the modal verb *trebati*, which indicates weak obligation.

expression. A non-modal construction was used in 9.09% of the cases, and the same percentage involved the employment of an adjective. Take a look at the following table, which details the shifts that occurred in the legal corpus.

Table 7. Shifts of the modal verb *must* in the legal corpus.

A shift in	From	To	Occurr.	ST sentence	Translation – TT
modal strength	strong obligation (*must*)	weak obligation (*trebati, valjati, biti potrebno, potrebne*)	9	*Consequently, the excretion amount established per animal **must** necessarily ensure that the upper limit of 170 kg is not breached.*	*Slijedom navedenog, količina ispuštanja dušika utvrđena po životinji u svakom slučaju **treba** osigurati da se ne premaši gornja granica od 170 kg.*
		permission (*moći*)	1	*It follows that the claims by which the applicants request the Tribunal to order payment of the ALC to which they maintain they are entitled **must** be rejected as inadmissible.*	*Iz toga slijedi da se zahtjev kojim tužitelji od Službeničkog suda traže da se naloži plaćanje NŽU-a za koje tvrde da imaju pravo **može** jedino odbiti kao neosnovan.*
means of expression	mod. vb. (*must*)	M.O.	5	*The official veterinarian **must** suspend the validity of the identification document for the period of the prohibitions provided for in paragraph 5 of this Article or in Article 5 of this Directive.*	*Službeni veterinar suspendira identifikacijski dokument u trajanju zabrana predviđenih u stavku 5. ovog članka ili u članku 5. ove Direktive.*
		lex. vb.	2	*Moreover, it **must** be recalled that the contested mark was registered for 'three-dimensional puzzles' in general, namely without being restricted to those that have a rotating capability (see paragraph 55 above).*	*Usto, **valja** podsjetiti da je osporavani žig registriran općenito za "trodimenzionalne slagalice", to jest bez ograničenja na slagalice s mogućnošću okretanja (vidjeti t. 55. gore).*
		mod. expr.	2	*Steps **must** be taken to limit the dangers to which persons are exposed, particularly when trains pass through stations.*	***Potrebno je** poduzeti mjere za ograničavanje opasnosti kojima su izložene osobe, naročito dok vlakovi prolaze kroz kolodvore.*
		N.M.	1	*That entails a verification of the allegations factored in the summary of reasons underpinning that decision, with the consequence that judicial review cannot be*	*To podrazumijeva provjeru navedenih činjenica u obrazloženju koje podupire spomenutu odluku, kako sudski nadzor ne bi bio ograničen na utvrđenje*

			*restricted to an assessment of the cogency in the abstract of the reasons relied on, but **must** concern whether those reasons, or, at the very least, one of those reasons, deemed sufficient in itself to support that decision, is substantiated (see Kadi II , paragraph 119).*	*apstraktne vrijednosti navedenih razloga, nego i na saznanje o tome jesu li ti razlozi ili barem jedan od njih, ako ga se smatra dovoljnim kako bi podržao tu istu odluku, dokazani (vidjeti presudu Kadi II, točku 119.).*
	adj.	1	*Despite these doubts, even if the original estimation of jobs was used to analyse the impact on the measures the following remarks **must** be made.*	*Unatoč tim sumnjama, čak i ako je izvorna procjena radnih mjesta korištena za analizu učinka na mjere, **potrebne** su sljedeće napomene.*

Further analysis of the syntactic properties of the sentences containing the modal verb *must* revealed that the verb in question was typically located in a main clause (70.76%), combining with a main verb that was usually dynamic (78.46%) and expressed in the active voice (55.38%), while the clausal subject was predominantly inanimate (83.07%). An overview of the described syntactic properties is presented in Table 8.

Table 8. Syntactic properties of the sentences containing *must*: legal corpus.

mod. vb.	**clause**		**vb. cat.**		**VO.**		**animacy**	
	main	subordinate	dynamic	stative	active	passive	anim.	inanim.
must	46	19	51	14	36	29	11	54
prior.	46	19	51	14	36	29	11	54

4.1.2. Must - literary corpus

The analysis of 65 randomly selected sentences containing the modal verb *must* that were extracted from the literary corpus revealed that 66.15% of the modal items had an epistemic flavor, followed by 26.15% of the cases involving a priority reading, while the remaining 7.69% involved a formulaic expression. Table 9 shows the translation solutions employed to translate the modal verb *must* and their distribution by modal flavor.

Table 9. *Must* – ST meanings and TT translation equivalents: literary corpus.

	mod. vb.	**adv.**		**M.O.**	**N.M.**	**adj.**		**ptcl.**[12]		**lex. vb.**
	morati	sigurno	obavezno	ind.		uvjeren	sigurna	valjda	očito	mislim
must	17	25	1	11	6	1	1	1	1	1
epist.	1	25		10	3	1	1	1	1	
prior.	13		1	1	2					
f. ex.[13]	3				1					1

Shifts in the strength of the modal verb occurred in 1.53% of the cases. The analysis demonstrated that those from logical necessity (*must*) to possibility (*valjda*) accounted for all shifts in modal strength found in the corpus.

Shifts in the means of expressing modality occurred in 73.84% of the cases, in 54.16% of which the modal verb was translated by an adverb. In 22.91% of the cases, the modal verb was omitted. In 12.5% of the cases, it was translated by a non-modal construction. Adjectives and particles were used in 4.16% of the cases, while in 2.83% of the cases, the modal verb was translated by a lexical verb. The following table details the shifts that occurred in the literary corpus.

Table 10. Shifts of the modal verb *must* in the literary corpus.

A shift in	**From**	**To**	**Occurr.**	**ST sentence**	**Translation – TT**
modal strength	logical necessity (*must*)	possibility (*valjda*)	1	*I think her powers **must** have been affected by shock, or something.* (HBP 95)	***Valjda** joj je šok ili nešto utjecalo na sposobnosti.* (Cro. 82)
means of expression	mod. vb. (*must*)	adv.	26	*You **must** be Mr. Dursley.* (HBP 45)	*Vi ste **sigurno** gospodin Dursley.* (Cro. 42)
		M.O.	11	*So it **must** have been a girl or a woman who gave Katie the necklace (...)* (HBP 517)	*Znači, ogrlicu joj je dala neka djevojčica ili žena (...)* (Cro. 414)
		N.M.	6	*We **must** be the first of our kind ever to set foot — (...)* (HBP 20)	*Kladim se da prije nas nitko od naših nije nogom kročio (...)* (Cro. 22)

[12] Particle.
[13] Formulaic expression.

	adj.	2	*Thought she **must** have been pure-blood, she was so good.* (HBP 20)	*Bila je tako sposobna da sam bio **uvjeren** u njezinu čistokrvnost.* (Cro. 61)
	ptcl.	2	*I think her powers **must** have been affected by shock, or something.* (HBP 95)	***Valjda** joj je šok ili nešto utjecalo na sposobnosti.* (Cro. 82)
	lex. vb.	1	*I **must** be mad, but yes.* (HBP 74)	***Mislim** da sam poludio, ali da.* (Cro. 64)

Further analysis of the syntactic properties of the sentences containing the modal verb *must* showed that this verb was typically (66.15%) located in a main clause, combining with a stative main verb (61.53%) expressed in the active voice (95.38%). The clausal subject was predominantly animate (72.30%). An overview of the described syntactic properties is presented in Table 11.

Table 11. Syntactic properties of the sentences containing *must*: literary corpus.

mod. vb.	**clause**		**vb. cat.**		**VO.**		**animacy**	
	main	subordinate	dynamic	stative	active	passive	anim.	inanim.
must	43	22	25	40	62	3	47	18
epist.	28	15	11	32	42	1	30	13
prior.	10	7	11	6	15	2	13	4
f. ex.	5		3	2	5		4	1

4.1.3. Should - legal corpus

The results of 65 randomly selected sentences containing the modal verb *should* taken from the legal corpus showed that all of the modal items had a priority flavor. Table 12 shows the translation equivalents used to translate the modal verb *should* in the legal corpus.

Table 12. *Should* – ST meanings and TT translation equivalents: legal corpus.

	mod. vb.	**mod. expr.**	**M.O.**

	trebati	morati	biti potrebno	ind.
must	18	4	9	5
prior.	18	4	9	9

Shifts in the strength of the modal verb were noted in 6.15% of the cases. The analysis revealed that those from weak obligation (*should*) to strong obligation (*morati*) accounted for all shifts in modal strength found in the corpus.

Shifts in the means of expressing modality occurred in 21.53% of the cases, 64.28% of which involved the translation of the modal verb by a modal expression, while the remaining 35.71% involved omission of the modal verb. The following table details the modal shifts that occurred in the legal corpus.

Table 13. Shifts of the modal verb *should* in the legal corpus.

A shift in	From	To	Occurr.	ST sentence	Translation – TT
modal strength	weak obligation (*should*)	strong obligation (*morati*)	4	*Charges to be imposed on airspace users **should** be established and applied in a fair and transparent manner, after consultation of users' representatives.*	*Naknade koje se naplaćuju korisnicima zračnog prostora **moraju** se odrediti i primjenjivati na pravedan i transparentan način, nakon savjetovanja s predstavnicima korisnika.*
means of expression	mod. vb. (*should*)	mod. expr.	9	*In the case of a line run by various pantographs, the maximum width **should** be considered.*	*Kada se na jednoj pruzi prometuje s različitim oduzimačima struje, **potrebno je** uzeti u obzir najveću širinu.*
		M.O.	5	*The brake performance tests **should** preferably be carried out on a single axle only.*	*Ispitivanja kočnog učinka po mogućnosti se ispituju samo na jednoj osovini.*

Further analysis of the syntactic properties of the sentences containing the modal verb *should* demonstrated that it was mainly (78.46%) encountered in a main clause and alongside a dynamic main verb (76.92%) expressed in the active voice (60%). The clausal subject was largely inanimate (95.38%). An overview of the described syntactic properties is presented in Table 14.

Table 14. Syntactic properties of the sentences containing *should*: legal corpus.

mod. vb.	**clause**		**vb. cat.**		**VO.**		**animacy**	
	main	subordinate	dynamic	stative	active	passive	anim.	inanim.
should	51	14	50	15	39	26	3	62
prior.	51	14	50	15	39	26	3	62

4.1.4. Should - literary corpus

The analysis of 65 randomly selected sentences containing the modal verb *should* extracted from the literary corpus identified priority flavor as the most frequent, accounting for 70.76% of the total meanings. Epistemic flavor appeared in 24.61% of the example sentences, while the remaining 4.61% involved a formulaic expression, which had no real modal meaning. Table 15 shows the translation solutions employed to translate *should* and their distribution by modal flavor.

Table 15. *Should* – ST meanings and TT translation equivalents: literary corpus.

	mod. vb.			**N.M.**	**M.O.**	**lex. vb.**		**f. ex.**	**adj.**	**ptcl.**
	trebati	morati	moći		ind.	misliti	zahtijevati		najizgledniji	vjerojatno
should	39	4	1	7	6	2	1	3	1	1
epist.	9	1		3	1	2				1
prior.	30	3	1	4	5		1		1	
f. ex.								3		

Shifts in the strength of the modal verb occurred in 7.69% of the cases. The analysis revealed that those from weak obligation (*should*) to strong obligation (*moratii*) amounted to 80% of the cases. In the remaining 20% of the cases, the modal verb's meaning shifted from weak obligation to permission (*moći*).

Shifts in the means of expressing modality were present in 32.30% of the cases, in 33.33% of which the modal verb was translated by a non-modal construction. The verb was omitted in 28.57% of the cases. It was translated by a lexical verb in 14.28% of the cases; the

same percentage involved the use of formulaic expressions, whereas those shifts that involved an adjective or a particle amounted to 4.76% of the total shifts in the target language texts. Take a look at the following table, which details the modal shifts that occurred in the literary corpus.

Table 16. Shifts of the modal verb *should* in the literary corpus.

A shift in	From	To	Occurr.	ST sentence	Translation – TT
modal strength	weak obligation (*should*)	strong obligation (*morati*)	4	*Or that the government **should** have somehow foreseen the freak hurricane in the West Country that had caused so much damage to both people and property.* (HBP 2)	*Ili da je vlada nekako **morala** predvidjeti posve neočekivani uragan u jugozapadnoj Engleskoj koji je nanio veliku štetu ljudima i imovini? (*Cro. 7)
		permission (*moći*)	1	*I thought this evening we **should** just go over the things we've done so far, because it's the last meeting before the holidays and there's no point starting anything new right before a three-week break —* (OoF 453–454)	*Mislio sam da bismo večeras **mogli** ponoviti sve što smo dosad radili, jer nam je ovo posljednji sastanak prije praznika i nema smisla da počinjemo nešto novo kad nasčeka trotjedna pauza…* (Cro. Ch.[14] 21)
means of expression	mod. vb. (*should*)	N.M.	7	*He felt that Hermione **should** have seen this coming.* (OoF 340)	*Čudio se što Hermiona to nije predvidjela.* (Cro. Ch. 16)
		M.O.	6	*You **should** definitely wear it in front of Fred and George.* (HBP 338)	*Svakako si to objesi oko vrata i prošeći pred Fredom i Georgeom.* (Cro. 273)
		lex. vb.	3	*Particular care **should** be taken during the hours of darkness.* (HBP 42)	*Osobit oprez **zahtijeva** se tijekom noćnih sati.* (Cro. 39)
		f. ex.	3	*You **should** hear my gran talk about you.* (HBP 139)	*Da samo čuješ kako moja baka govori o tebi.* (Cro. 114)
		ptcl.	1	*If my parents could see the use it was being put to now... well, my mother's portrait **should** give you some idea...* (OoF 115)	*Da moji roditelji mogu vidjeti čemu trenutno služi njihova kuća... pa, **vjerojatno** možeš pretpostaviti, s obzirom na to kako se ponaša portret moje majke...* (Cro. Ch. 6)
		adj.	1	*Nobody seemed to find Scrimgeour s pretense that he did not know Harry's*	*Nije se činilo da je itko povjerovao kako Scrimgeour ne zna*

[14] Chapter.

	*name convincing, or find it natural that he **should** be chosen to accompany the Minister around the garden when Ginny, Fleur, and George also had clean plates.* (HBP 342)	*Harryjevo ime, ili da je on **najizgledniji** kandidat da s ministrom šeta po vrtu, s obzirom na to da su Ginny, Fleur i George također već ispraznili svoje tanjure.* (Cro. 276)

Further analysis of the syntactic properties of the example sentences containing the modal verb *should* revealed that the verb in question was usually (67.69%) found in a main clause and alongside a main verb that was dynamic (53.84%) and expressed in the active voice (92.30%), while the clausal subject was, for the most part, animate (81.53%). An overview of the described syntactic properties is presented in Table 17.

Table 17. Syntactic properties of the sentences containing *should*: literary corpus.

mod. vb.	**clause**		**vb. cat.**		**VO.**		**animacy**	
	main	subordinate	dynamic	stative	active	passive	anim.	inanim.
should	44	21	35	30	60	5	53	12
epist.	14	4	9	8	15	1	8	9
prior.	27	17	26	19	42	4	42	3
f. exp.	3			3	3		3	

4.1.5. Ought to - legal corpus

The analysis of 65 randomly selected sentences containing the modal verb *ought to* that were extracted from the legal corpus showed that all of the modal items carried a priority flavor. Table 18 shows the translation solutions employed to translate the modal verb *ought to* in the legal corpus.

Table 18. *Ought to* – ST meanings and TT translation equivalents: legal corpus.

	mod. vb.		**mod. expr.**		**M.O.**
	trebati	morati	biti potrebno	biti dužan	ind.
ought to	44	14	4	1	2

prior.	44	14	4	1	2

Shifts in the strength of the modal verb were observed in 21.53% of the cases. The analysis revealed that those from weak obligation (*ought to*) to strong obligation (*morati*) made up all shifts in modal strength that were found in the legal corpus.

Shifts in the means of expressing modality occurred in 10.76% of the cases, 71.42% of which involved the translation of the modal verb by a modal expression, while the remaining 28.58% involved omission of the modal verb. The following table details the shifts that occurred in the legal corpus.

Table 19. Shifts of the modal verb *ought to* in the legal corpus.

A shift in	From	To	Occurr.	ST sentence	Translation – TT
modal strength	weak obligation (*ought to*)	strong obligation (*morati*)	14	*Special national provisions on the activity of mutual societies and on monitoring by supervisory authorities **ought to** apply fully to mutual societies.*	*Posebna nacionalna pravila vezana uz aktivnosti uzajamnih društava i kontrolu nadzornih tijela **moraju** se bez ograničenja primjenjivati i na europska uzajamna društva.*
means of expression	mod. vb. (*ought to*)	mod. expr.	5	*Suitable wood assortments **ought to** be used physically rather than to serve as a fuel.*	*Prikladan izbor drvnih proizvoda **potrebno je** koristiti fizički, a ne da oni služe kao gorivo.*
		M.O.	2	*In the opinion of the Committee this clause **ought to** operate only in exceptional cases.*	*Prema mišljenju Odbora, ta se klauzula primjenjuje samo u iznimnim slučajevima.*

Further analysis of the syntactic properties of the example sentences containing the modal verb *ought to* demonstrated that it was found usually (67.69%) in a main clause, combining with a dynamic main verb (70.76%) expressed in the active voice (61.53%). The clausal subject was mostly inanimate (92.30%). An overview of the described syntactic properties is presented in Table 20.

Table 20. Syntactic properties of the sentences containing *ought to*: legal corpus.

mod. vb.	clause		vb. cat.		VO.		animacy	
	main	subordinate	dynamic	stative	active	passive	anim.	inanim.
ought to	44	21	46	19	40	25	5	60
prior.	44	21	46	19	40	25	5	60

4.1.6. Ought to - literary corpus

The results of the analysis of 65 randomly selected sentences containing the modal verb *ought to* extracted from the literary corpus revealed that 87.7% of the modal items had a priority flavor, followed by 10.77% that had an epistemic flavor, while the remaining 1.53% of the sentences involved a formulaic expression. Table 21 shows the Croatian equivalents used in the target texts and their distribution by modal flavor.

Table 21. *Ought to* – ST meanings and TT translation equivalents: literary corpus.

	mod. vb.		N.M.	M.O.
	trebati	morati		ind.
ought to	54	5	5	1
epist.	6	1		
prior.	47	4	5	1
f. ex.	1			

Shifts in the strength of the modal verb were noted in 7.69% of the cases. The analysis showed that those from weak obligation (*ought to*) to strong obligation (*morati*) accounted for all shifts in modal strength encountered in the corpus.

Shifts in the means of expressing modality occurred in 9.23% of the cases, in 83.33% of which the modal verb was translated by a non-modal construction. In the remaining 16.67% of the cases, the modal verb was omitted in the target text. The following table details the shifts that occurred in the literary corpus.

Table 22. Shifts of the modal verb *ought to* in the literary corpus.

A shift in	From	To	Occurr.	ST sentence	Translation – TT

modal strength	weak obligation (*ought to*)	strong obligation (*must*)	5	*First years **ought to** know that the forest in the grounds is out of bounds to students — and a few of our older students ought to know by now too.* (OoF 210)	*Prvoškolci **moraju** znati da je učenicima zabranjen pristup u šumu u sklopu perivoja - a to je dosad trebao naučiti i pokoji naš stariji učenik.* (Cro. Ch. 11)
means of expression	mod. vb. (*ought to*)	N.M.	5	*We **ought to** double back for a bit, just to make sure we're not being followed!* (OoF 57)	*Bilo bi dobro da se neko vrijeme vraćamo istim putem kojim smo došli, da budemo sigurni kako nas nitko ne prati!* (Cro. Ch. 3)
		M.O.	1	*He did not want to hear what Ron had to say, did not want to hear Ron tell him he had been stupid, or suggest that they **ought to** go back to Hogwarts.* (OoF 779)	*Nije htio čuti kako mu Ron govori da je bio glup ili kako mu predlaže da se vrate u Hogwarts.* (Cro. Ch. 34)

Further analysis of the syntactic properties of the sentences containing the modal verb *ought to* revealed that the verb in question was typically (69.23%) located in a subordinate clause, combining with a stative main verb (53.84%) expressed in the active voice (90.76%). The clausal subject was mostly inanimate (84.61%). An overview of the described syntactic properties is presented in Table 23.

Table 23. Syntactic properties of the sentences containing *ought to*: literary corpus.

mod. vb.	**clause**		**vb. cat.**		**VO.**		**animacy**	
	main	subordinate	dynamic	stative	active	passive	anim.	inanim.
ought to	20	45	30	35	59	6	55	10
epist.	2	5	2	5	7		4	3
prior.	18	39	28	29	51	6	50	7
f. exp.		1		1	1		1	

4.1.7. May - legal corpus

The analysis of 65 randomly selected sentences containing the modal verb *may* that I extracted from the legal corpus demonstrated that this verb mostly had a priority flavor (81.53% of the cases). An epistemic flavor was present in 10.76% of the cases, and the remaining 7.69% involved a dynamic flavor. Table 24 shows the translation solutions employed to translate *may* and their distribution by modal flavor.

Table 24. *May* – ST meanings and TT translation equivalents: legal corpus.

	mod. vb.		**adv.**	**M.O.**
	moći	smjeti	možda	ind.
may	58	2	3	2
epist.	4		3	
prior.	50	2		1
dynam.	4			1

Shifts in the strength of the modal verb were not observed. Shifts in the means of expressing modality occurred in 7.69% of the cases, 60% of which involved the translation of the modal verb by an adverb, while the remaining 40% involved omission of the modal verb. Take a look at the following table, which details the modal shifts that occurred in the legal corpus.

Table 25. Shifts of the modal verb *may* in the legal corpus.

A shift in	**From**	**To**	**Occurr.**	**ST sentence**	**Translation – TT**
means of expression	mod. vb. (*may*)	adv.	3	*As for the remaining quantities, they represented a low and stable market share around 2 %, with the exception of the IP, and as also explained in recital 66 of the provisional Regulation, these imports* ***may*** *have contributed, albeit not significantly, to the material injury*	*Što se tiče preostalih količina, one predstavljaju nizak i stabilan tržišni udjel od oko 2 %, s izuzetkom RIP-a, a, kao što je objašnjeno u uvodnoj izjavi 66. privremene Uredbe, te su uvezene količine* ***možda*** *pridonijele, iako ne značajno, materijalnoj šteti koju je pretrpjela industrija Zajednice.*

	M.O.	2	*Each delegate **may** be accompanied by appropriate experts. suffered by the Community industry.*	*Svakog člana predstavlja jedan izaslanik.*

Further analysis of the syntactic properties of the sentences containing the modal verb *may* revealed that this modal verb was typically located in a main clause (84.61%). It mainly appeared alongside a dynamic main verb (84.61%) expressed in the active voice (90.76%), while the clausal subject was largely inanimate (89.23%). An overview of the described syntactic properties is presented in Table 26.

Table 26. Syntactic properties of the sentences containing *may*: legal corpus.

mod. vb.	**clause**		**vb. cat.**		**VO.**		**animacy**	
	main	subordinate	dynamic	stative	active	passive	anim.	inanim.
may	55	10	55	10	58	7	7	58
epist.	2	5	5	2	7		1	6
prior.	49	4	48	5	46	7	6	47
dynam.	4	1	2	3	5			5

4.1.8. May - literary corpus

The findings of the analysis of 65 randomly selected sentences containing the modal verb *may* extracted from the literary corpus showed that 63.07% of the modal items carried an epistemic flavor. A priority reading was observed in 26.15% of the cases, and the remaining 10.76% involved a formulaic expression. Table 27 shows the translation solutions employed to translate the modal verb *may* in the literary corpus and their distribution by modal flavor.

Table 27. *May* – ST meanings and TT translation equivalents: literary corpus.

	mod. vb.			**adv.**	**M.O.**	**f. ex.**	**N.M.**
	moći	morati	trebati	možda	ind.		
may	17	1	1	28	11	5	2
epist.	5	1	1	28	6		1

prior.	12				2	1	2
f. ex.					3	4	

Shifts in the strength of the modal verb were noted in 3.07% of the cases. The analysis revealed that those from logical possibility (*may*) to strong logical necessity (*morati*) amounted to 50% of the total shifts in strength, while the remaining half involved those from logical possibility to weak logical necessity (*trebati*).

Shifts in the means of expressing modality were encountered in 70.76% of the cases, 60.86% of which involved the translation of the modal verb by an adverb. In 23.91% of the cases, the modal verb was omitted. The translator employed a formulaic expression in 10.86% of the cases. 4.34% of the shifts resulted from translating the modal verb by a non-modal construction. The following table details the modal shifts that occurred in the literary corpus.

Table 28. Shifts of the modal verb *may* in the literary corpus.

A shift in	From	To	Occurr.	ST sentence	Translation – TT
modal strength	possibility (*may*)	strong logical necessity (*morati*)	1	*Nymphadora Tonks **may** need to spend a little time in St. Mungo's, but it seems that she will make a full recovery.* (OoF 822)	*Nymphadora Tonks će neko vrijeme **morati** ležati u Svetom Mungu, ali čini se da će se potpuno oporaviti.* (Cro. Ch. 37)
		weak logical necessity (*trebati*)	1	*(...) — by which time, many of you **may** be ready to take your tests (...)* (HBP 382)	*(...) što znači da bi mnogi od vas dotad **trebali** bez problema izaći na ispit (...)* (Cro. 308)
means of expression	mod. vb. (*may*)	adv.	28	*As I have hinted above, Dumbledore's regime at Hogwarts **may** soon be over.* (OoF 297–298)	*Kako sam već napomenuo u pismu, Dumbledoreova vladavina Hogwartsom **možda** se primiče kraju.* (Cro. Ch. 14)
		M.O.	11	*No, like all young people, you are quite sure that you alone feel and think, you alone recognize danger, you alone are the only one clever enough to realize what the Dark Lord **may** be planning..."* (OoF	*Ne, kao i sva mladež svijeta, ti si čvrsto uvjeren da jedino ti osjećaš i misliš, da jedino ti prepoznaješ opasnost, da jedino ti imaš dovoljno mozgada shvatiš što planira Gospodar tame...* (Cro.

			496)	Ch. 23)
	f. ex.	5	*Er — **may** I offer you a glass of gin?* (HBP 265)	*Ovaj... jeste li za čašu džina?* (Cro. 213)
	N.M.	2	*Undoubtedly Voldemort had penetrated many more of its secrets than most of the students who pass through the place, but he **may** have felt that there were still mysteries to unravel, stores of magic to tap.* (HBP 431)	*Nema sumnje da je Voldemort otkrio više njegovih tajni od većine učenika koji su se ovdje školovali, ali nije isključeno da je smatrao kako u njemu ima još zagonetki koje nije odgonetnuo, još izvora magije iz kojih bi **mogao** crpiti moć.* (Cro. 345)

Further analysis of the syntactic properties of the sentences containing the modal verb *may* revealed that this modal verb was mainly (76.92%) located in a main clause. It was usually encountered alongside a dynamic main verb (58.46%) expressed in the active voice (84.61%). The clausal subject of those sentences was usually animate (69.23%). An overview of the described syntactic properties is presented in Table 29.

Table 29. Syntactic properties of the sentences containing *may*: literary corpus.

mod. vb.	**clause**		**vb. cat.**		**VO.**		**animacy**	
	main	subordinate	dynamic	stative	active	passive	anim.	inanim.
may	50	15	38	27	55	10	45	20
epist.	31	10	23	18	37	4	29	12
prior.	14	3	11	6	11	6	10	7
f. exp.	5	2	4	3	7		6	1

4.2. *Qualitative analysis and discussion*

4.2.1. Must – legal corpus

Having quantitatively analyzed the sentences containing *must* that were extracted from the legal corpus, we can conclude that this modal verb is mainly translated into Croatian by the modal verb *morati*. In all instances, the verb carries a priority flavor, which comes as no surprise given the nature of legal discourse. As Jelovšek (2021: 36–37) points out, the civil law system, by definition, deals with hypothetical situations, which is why epistemic modal expressions are consequently dismissed as redundant. Dissecting its primary meaning (*strong obligation*), *must* predominantly (in an approximate ratio of 2:1) appears in provisions that impose a requirement. These provisions lay down the conditions to be met in order for the state of affairs stated in the provision to be realized (Krapivkina 2017: 310; Kimble 1982). This is in accordance with Jelovšek's (2021: 29) claim that "in its deontic sense, the verb *must* in legal texts is by rule used for requirements that express the existence of an obligation that is usually procedural." This modal verb is also used to express obligation in the narrow sense, where an agent is ordered by law to act in the interest of a particular action itself. Requirements are expressed: 1) explicitly, in cases where certain set expressions (typically *in order to*) or other linguistic markers within a sentence indicate a requirement (1); and 2) implicitly, when a requirement is traceable to the context in which it is embedded as one of the conditions for the fulfillment of the main provision, which usually involves the modal verb *shall* (2). The two ways of expressing a requirement can be seen as follows:

(1) (ST) *In order to ensure the application of the provisions of Article 86 of the Treaty the Commission* ***must*** *have the necessary information.*
(TT) *Kako bi se osigurala primjena odredbi članka 86. Ugovora, Komisija* ***mora*** *imati potrebne podatke.*

(2) (ST) *In order to be granted approval as provided for in Article 4, a breeding establishment* ***shall*** *comply with the conditions set out in this Chapter:*
(1) The breeding establishment ***must*** *be clearly demarcated and separated from its surroundings or the animals confined and located so as not to pose a health risk to animal holdings whose health status might be jeopardised.*
(TT*) Za dobivanje odobrenja iz članka 4., objekt za uzgoj* ***mora*** *udovoljavati uvjetima*

navedenim u ovom poglavlju:

1. Objekt za uzgoj ***mora*** *biti jasno razgraničen i odvojen od svoje okoline ili životinje moraju biti zatvorene i smještene tako da ne predstavljaju rizik za zdravlje gospodarstvima koja drže životinje, a čiji zdravstveni status može biti ugrožen.*

The prevalence of using *must* to impose requirements may serve as an explanation for the remarkably high occurrence of this modal verb in subordinate clauses (see Section 4.1.1.), as shown in (3):

(3) (ST) *The Administrative Board shall decide on the amounts which* ***must*** *be released by each member in proportion to the contributions which it has agreed to pay and shall establish the deadline by which the members must pay their contributions.*

(TT) *Upravni odbor odlučuje o iznosima koje svaki član* ***mora*** *osloboditi razmjerno doprinosima za koje se obvezao da će ih uplatiti, kao i o krajnjim rokovima do kojih članovi moraju uplatiti svoje doprinose.*

When conveying obligation, *must* usually appears in a main clause; see example (4).

(4) (ST) *Member States* ***must*** *report to the Commission by 31 December 2009 on the full implementation of the Directive.*

(TT) *Države članice* ***moraju*** *do 31. prosinca 2009. izvijestiti Komisiju o potpunoj provedbi Direktive.*

The findings reveal that *must* most commonly appears in a main clause, which is mainly unconditional in both the source and target language texts. The modal verb in question typically takes a dynamic main verb expressed in the active voice. The subjects of those sentences are mainly inanimate. Consider the following example.

(5) (ST) *The coordinating body* ***must*** *send the computer files completely and only once.*

(TT) *Koordinacijsko tijelo* ***mora*** *poslati računalnu datoteku u cijelosti i samo jednom.*

As far as shifts in the strength of this modal verb are concerned, it may strike one as peculiar that these are more frequent in the legal corpus. The field of legal science ought to be characterized by exactness, which makes the aforementioned result all the more surprising. A total of 10 corpus sentences contain a shift in modal strength. In all of them, the strength of the verb is reduced.

Nine of those involve shifting from strong obligation to weak obligation, with five of them involving the modal verb *trebati*. Example (6) below illustrates this type of shift in the strength of obligation.

(6) (ST) *When purchasing the tender document, for the purposes of being contacted and receiving communications the purchaser **must** also submit a concession bidder identification sheet, on which they must state their name and address, an e-mail address (to which communications from the contracting authority regarding the tender document may be sent) and their tax identifier and declare that they are duly authorised to purchase the tender document.*

(TT) *Pri kupnji dokumenta natječaja, u svrhu mogućnosti kontaktiranja i primanja priopćenja kupac **treba** predati i identifikacijski list ponuditelja, na kojem je potrebno navesti ime i adresu, adresu e-pošte (na koju će biti poslana priopćenja ugovornog tijela o dokumentu natječaja) i porezni identifikator te izjavu da je propisno ovlašten za kupnju dokumenta natječaja.*

Further examples that involve a shift in the strength of the modal verb have to do with using the lexical verb *valjati* and the modal verb *moći* in shifting from strong obligation to weak obligation and permission, respectively, as seen in examples (7–8).

(7) (ST) *Since the Commission has been unsuccessful, it **must** be ordered to pay the costs, in accordance with the form of order sought by the applicant.*

(TT) *Budući da je Komisija izgubila spor, istoj **valja** naložiti snošenje troškova postupka sukladno zahtjevu tužitelja.*

(8) (ST) *It follows that the claims by which the applicants request the Tribunal to order payment of the ALC to which they maintain they are entitled **must** be rejected as inadmissible.*

(TT) *Iz toga slijedi da se zahtjev kojim tužitelji od Službeničkog suda traže da se naloži plaćanje NŽU-a za koje tvrde da imaju pravo **može** jedino odbiti kao neosnovan.*

The remaining shifts in strength have to do with the use of the modal expression *biti potrebno* and the adjective *potrebne,* as exemplified in (9) and (10), respectively.

(9) (ST) *Steps **must** be taken to limit the dangers to which persons are exposed, particularly when trains pass through stations*.

(TT) ***Potrebno je** poduzeti mjere za ograničavanje opasnosti kojima su izložene osobe, naročito dok vlakovi prolaze kroz kolodvore*.

(10) (ST) *Despite these doubts, even if the original estimation of jobs was used to analyse the impact on the measures the following remarks **must** be made.*

(TT) *Unatoč tim sumnjama, čak i ako je izvorna procjena radnih mjesta korištena za analizu učinka na mjere, **potrebne** su sljedeće napomene*.

The shifts from the above sets of examples could be explained by taking into account the context (including the source of modality and the narrower sentence context) and the semantic influence of certain lexical elements on the modal verb. One possible explanation for the fact that shifts in modal strength are more commonly found in the legal corpus is that part of the meaning (or strength) of a legal text may be provided by the semantic framework of the text itself. The previous claim is consistent with what is proposed in a study conducted by Verhulst et al. (2012), in which the authors propose a typology of deontic sources. In what they label "objective modality," which is inherent to legal discourse, the sources from which an obligation can arise are 1) rules, 2) conditions, and 3) circumstances. With regard to examples (6) and (7), the source is a rule (an institutional rule and a law, respectively, both qualifying as "more strongly binding forces" [Verhulst et al. 2012: 5]). Such a framework comes with its own force, allowing weaker modal expressions to draw on it. Therefore, in statements such as the ones given above, contextual enrichment of their semantic content may play a significant role in guiding translation decisions. Accordingly, it goes without saying that the procedure stated in example (6) must be strictly adhered to in order to fulfill the intended goal. One should therefore be aware of this framework of rules, regulations, or a series of actions in which an obligation can be embedded and thus gain strength, representing a special case of strong obligation. For example, the weak obligation expressed in (7) was embedded in an obligation previously imposed by an authoritative institution acting as the source of the obligation (the General Court). The modal verb derives the rest of its strength from additional context; the risk of potential damage to the party filing the lawsuit does not allow non-compliance with the obligation, and there is an established procedure that must be followed in such cases. This is closely related to another criterion set forth by Depraetere and Verhulst (2008) that can be used to determine the strength of

modal statements: “the likelihood of actualization of the situation that is claimed to be necessary.” This likelihood depends on two key factors. The first states that there are situations in which non-compliance is impossible, while the second takes into account the gravity of non-compliance, that is, the consequences that may arise in cases of non-compliance. Consequences that may adversely affect one’s health, safety, or finances produce high modality statements, and the strength of such modal statements does not depend so much on a modal verb as on the overall context. The previous explanation is equally applicable to example (9).

In regard to (8), what is intriguing is that the shift is not only in strength but also in modal force, which shifts from necessity to possibility. The only logical explanation for this translation is the fact that the translated piece is semantically strengthened by the adverb *jedino* (‘only’). The adverb rules out all other possible courses of action except for the one to be followed. In other words, the permission meaning of *moći* (‘may’) is associated with the adverb *jedino*, and they together constitute the intended strong obligation meaning, covered by the modal verb *must* in the source language text. This example therefore qualifies as one semantically reinforced by a linguistic marker, which is another factor that may affect modal strength, according to Verhulst et al. (2012). Both of these factors—contextual frameworks and the semantic influence of lexical items on modal verbs—were also mentioned in some earlier studies. For example, Knežević and Brdar (2011) demonstrate the essential role of both factors in the translation of legal texts and confirm their unquestionable impact on the choice of translation strategies.

With regard to (10), the shift is again caused by contextual elements. The statement in question is semantically related to what Palić and Omerović (2022: 281) call “formulaic constructions,” which are a type of grammatical statement that is peripheral to the concept of modality. In such constructions, a modal verb is usually complemented by some verb (or any other lexical item) of communication, that is, illocution. As a result, the statement goes through what Huddleston and Pullum (2002: 177) call “pragmatic weakening,” as there is no longer a contextual basis that would link it to a strong obligation.

When it comes to shifts in the means of expressing modality, *must* is, in a noticeable number of cases, translated by omitting the modal verb and replacing it by the present indicative:

(11) (ST) *The original of the certificate **must** be completed and signed by an official veterinarian.*

(TT) *Izvornik certifikata **popunjava** i potpisuje službeni veterinar.*

In example (11), the strong obligation expressed by the verb *must* in the source language text is preserved in the target language text even though the modal verb is omitted. A declarative sentence without a modal verb may, depending on the context, have the same legal effect even though it expresses obligation less explicitly, as Nurmi & Kivilehto (2019: 144) assert: "Deontic obligation is not always expressed explicitly. When a text is normative in nature, also the present indicative can be used in a deontic sense." The present indicative appears in the translation as a result of the connection between *must* and the modal verb *shall*, which is the preferred means of expressing strong obligation in EU legislation (European Union 2020: 85) and, as a rule, is translated into Croatian by the present indicative. As mentioned earlier in this section, *must* is typically used to impose requirements, while *shall* is intended for creating duties. It is significant that in all cases of omission in the corpus, the proposition indicates obligation *sensu stricto* (duty) and never a requirement, which leads to a parallel being drawn with the verb *shall* and possibly affects the translator's choice. In contrast to *shall*, *must* is most often translated as *morati*. Given that both verbs indicate strong obligation, the question arises as to why translators decide on different solutions. One potential explanation is the impact of non-legal genres on the translator when they encounter the verb *must* (Matković 2022: 23). In non-legal texts, *must* is significantly more frequent than *shall* and is used to communicate strong obligation, whereas *shall* typically expresses volition. This line of reasoning will prompt the translator to follow the pattern and use *morati* as the natural equivalent of *must* in legal discourse as well. In this case, using the equivalent modal verb is a far more conventional solution than employing the indicative, which carries a strong undertone of institutionalization. Another explanation for translating the verb *must* as *morati* could be the translator's uncertainty regarding the possible existence of subtle semantic differences between *must* and *shall* when expressing strong obligation. As a result, the translator will often resolve the existing dilemma by translating *must* into Croatian differently from *shall*.

There are also some provisions in which *must* is translated by the modal expressions *biti potrebno* and *biti dužan*, numbering one occurrence each. Their use is exemplified as follows:

(12) (ST) *Steps **must** be taken to limit the dangers to which persons are exposed, particularly when trains pass through stations.*

(TT) ***Potrebno je** poduzeti mjere za ograničavanje opasnosti kojima su izložene osobe, naročito dok vlakovi prolaze kroz kolodvore.*

(13) (ST) *The contracting entity **must** keep a copy of the technical file throughout the service life of the subsystem; it must be sent to any other Member State which so requests.*
(TT) *Naručitelj **je dužan** čuvati presliku tehničke dokumentacije tijekom čitavog vijeka trajanja podsustava; na zahtjev ju je dužan dostaviti drugim državama članicama.*

In (12), a shift in the means of expressing modality occurs. The modal expression *biti potrebno* ('to be necessary') only differs in grammatical form from the modal verb *trebati* ('should'). Consequently, the strength of the expression shifts from strong to weak obligation, which can be explained by considering the criteria outlined earlier in this section that concern the contextual framework of the source language text. In this regard, it is apparent that failure to comply with the order specified in (12) can carry consequences that put people's lives in jeopardy. This is sufficient for the obligation expressed in the proposition to be regarded as strong, regardless of the modal verb's strength. Example (13) contains a shift in the form of the modal expression in question without additional alterations to its meaning, which remains unaffected. This case is corroborated by Palić and Omerović's (2022: 275) claim that the modal expression *biti dužan* ('to be obliged') corresponds to the verb *morati* as its closely related semantic paraphrase. Furthermore, Hansen (2007: 34) also supports the previous claim, asserting that *morati* can replace *biti dužan* when expressing strong obligation.

There is also an example where an adjective replaces the modal verb in the target language text. Note that the example sentence in question has already been mentioned earlier, since it qualifies for both types of shifts (strength and means of expression).

(14) (ST) *Despite these doubts, even if the original estimation of jobs was used to analyse the impact on the measures the following remarks **must** be made.*
(TT) *Unatoč tim sumnjama, čak i ako je izvorna procjena radnih mjesta korištena za analizu učinka na mjere, **potrebne su** sljedeće napomene.*

The explanation offered for the shift in (12) also applies to example (14), with the difference that here it is an adjective one deals with rather than a modal expression.

The final shift of this type is produced by translating *must* by a non-modal construction. Take a look at (15).

(15) (ST) *That entails a verification of the allegations factored in the summary of reasons underpinning that decision, with the consequence that judicial review cannot be*

restricted to an assessment of the cogency in the abstract of the reasons relied on, but ***must*** *concern whether those reasons, or, at the very least, one of those reasons, deemed sufficient in itself to support that decision, is substantiated (see Kadi II , paragraph 119).*
(TT) *To podrazumijeva provjeru navedenih činjenica u obrazloženju koje podupire spomenutu odluku, kako sudski nadzor ne bi bio ograničen na utvrđenje apstraktne vrijednosti navedenih razloga, nego i na saznanje o tome jesu li ti razlozi ili barem jedan od njih, ako ga se smatra dovoljnim kako bi podržao tu istu odluku, dokazani (vidjeti presudu Kadi II, točku 119.).*

In this example, two major factors may be playing a role in causing the complete loss of modality in the target language text. The first of them has to do with the complexity of the sentence. It is fairly complex, meaning that the pieces that had been translated when *must* was reached may have made the remaining parts of the sentence (in which *must* is located) dependent on them and thus subject to changes and modifications in form. The other factor is the fact that the preceding verb *can* is used in the negative form (*cannot*). *Can* does not express obligation but permission, and accordingly, its negative form does not indicate strong prohibition, as the negative forms of *shall* or *must* would otherwise indicate. Once associated with *can*, *must* no longer expresses strong obligation, which it would express if it were contrasted with the negative forms of *shall* or *must*.

4.2.2. Must – literary corpus

Having analyzed the modal verb *must* extracted from the literary corpus, it may be interesting to note that its most common translation is not an equivalent modal verb but an adverb: *sigurno* ('certainly'). However, this finding is not unexpected if one looks at the most common semantic values expressed by *must*: Epistemic flavor predominates (in which case translating *must* as *morati* is stylistically marked, as will be discussed shortly), followed by priority flavor, while in a negligible percentage of cases, formulaic expressions appear. Within the epistemic modal group, the subject predominantly takes the third-person singular personal pronouns (*he*, *she*, *it*). Such examples are by far the most numerous; they occur about two-and-a-half times as frequently as those where the subject is in the second-person singular or plural (*you*/*you all*). The first- and third-person plurals are infrequent and appear with roughly the same frequency in the

texts. What is remarkable is the use of *must* to refer to the past. Almost half of all epistemic example sentences from the literary corpus have some past reference, typically expressed using *must have + past participle* constructions. This contrasts sharply with the occurrences of *must* in the legal corpus, where only present-time references appear.

Within the priority modal group, there is a relative balance regarding the distribution of deontic obligation by grammatical person. Those examples in which the speaker is the source and the addressee is a third-person singular subject are slightly more prevalent. Second-person singular and third-person plural items are roughly equally frequent, while those in the first-person singular and plural are slightly less common. In the latter case, the speaker and the addressee are the same person, forming so-called "constructions of self-commitment" (Palić & Omerović 2022: 276). These refer to occasions in which the speaker imposes on themselves or their group the obligation to carry out a particular action. Nearly all of the priority examples involve present-time reference; future-time reference is rare, while past-time reference is not found.

When it comes to shifts in the strength of the modal verb, only one example is present that involves such a shift. As previously stated, it may seem unusual that a literary translation, which belongs to a genre that is often claimed to be characterized by freedom of expression, would adhere more closely to the core meaning of a modal verb than a legal translation, which ought to be characterized by semantic precision. In order to explain this, the context may be helpful once again. As outlined earlier, legal discourse relies on the institutionalized force of the framework of rules and procedures in which a particular proposition is embedded. Such a framework is not usually encountered in literary works, at least not in the ones the present thesis examines. Consequently, the literary translator would not be able to rely on the aforementioned framework to compensate for a lack of modal strength if they were to use an insufficiently strong modal expression in the target text. Furthermore, the modal verb *shall*, which in legal texts expresses strong obligation and corresponds to the semantically related verb *must*, does not usually appear in literary texts with the same meaning. *Shall* is used in them, for the most part, to communicate volition, thus not filling the same semantic slot as *must*. Therefore, the translator, deprived of dealing with the intricacies of the semantic relations that exist in the language of the law, will usually opt for the most straightforward solution, which is translating *must* as *morati*. In

the literary texts, there is only a single instance of a shift in the strength of the modal verb, one from logical necessity to probability. This case is illustrated in example (16).

(16) (ST) *I think her powers* ***must*** *have been affected by shock, or something*. (HBP 95)

(TT) ***Valjda*** *joj je šok ili nešto utjecalo na sposobnosti.* (Cro. 82)

In the example given above, the translation is not dictated by the context but by certain lexical items. As can be seen, the lexical verb *think* precedes the modal verb *must*. The certainty expressed by *must* is now semantically framed within the uncertainty expressed by *think*, which causes *must* to lose some of its strength. Moreover, the tentativeness is further emphasized by the expression *or something*. By uttering this, the speaker indicates that what would otherwise be certain is now only one of the possible scenarios. All this was sufficient to have the translator reduce the strength of the modal verb and translate it by an adverb that indicates mere probability.

When it comes to shifts in the means of expressing modality, they are considerably more common in the literary corpus. This is not surprising because epistemic flavor occurs far more frequently in literary texts because of the very nature of the genre, and the findings demonstrate that epistemic *must* is usually translated by an adverb. Another possibility is to use the modal phrase *mora biti da* ('it must be that'). However, this construction is overly syntactically complex and thus not conducive to articulate expression. The corpus contains only a single instance where a corresponding modal verb is used to render epistemic *must*:

(17) (ST) *I thought you* ***must*** *know about it!* (HBP 32)

(TT) *I mislila sam da ti* ***moraš*** *znati!* (Cro. 32)

When expressing priority meanings, the modal verb *morati* is conducive to constructions that do not exhibit such syntactic complexity. As a result, shifts in the means of expressing modality occur significantly less frequently.

Omission of the modal verb is identified as the second most common cause of shifts in the means of expressing modality in the literary corpus. In nearly all source text sentences whose translation involves omission, the modal verb appears alongside a lexical verb that expresses a degree of certainty in the statement. This is where semantic enrichment occurs. All but one of the example sentences involving omission are epistemic. The main verb in those sentences is usually

stative (mostly *be*) and relates to thoughts and opinions, such as *think*, *know*, and *suggest*. Accordingly, the modal verb appears in a subordinate clause in nearly all source text sentences whose translation involves omission of the modal verb. Additionally, in such instances past-time reference prevails. The following example shows the shift in question:

(18) (ST) *Harry* ***knew*** *this* ***must*** *be Ogden; he was the only person in sight, and he was also wearing the strange assortment of clothes so often chosen by inexperienced wizards trying to look like Muggles: in this case, a frock coat and spats over a striped one-piece bathing costume.* (HBP 199)

(TT) *Harry je* ***znao*** *da je to Ogden, ne samo zato što je bio jedina osoba na vidiku nego i zato što je na sebi imao čudnu mješavinu inače nespojivih odjevnih predmeta, što je bilo tipično za čarobnjake koji nisu imali iskustva u prerušavanju u bezjake.* (Cro. 163)

Where non-modal translations of the modal verb *must* are found, *must* appears with equal frequency in epistemic and priority statements. All the example sentences in which a non-modal construction is used have present-time references. Furthermore, in all but one of the cases, the modal verb is located in a main clause. Nevertheless, it is difficult to draw a definitive conclusion regarding the translator's reasoning in such cases. In general, decision-making is affected not only by the context and tone of the work being translated but also by the style and creativity of the translator. See example (19).

(19) (ST) "He lives here?" asked Bella in a voice of contempt. "*Here*? In this Muggle dunghill? We must be the first of our kind ever to set foot —" (HBP 20)

(TT) "On živi tu?" prezirno upita Bella. "*Tu*? Na tom bezjačkom gnojištu? Kladim se da prije nas nitko od naših nije nogom kročio..."[15] (Cro. 22)

A plausible explanation for the above rendering is the tone of the situation in which the characters have found themselves. The speaker expresses astonishment at an aspect of the situation. This person's amazement takes on a culminating tone in their exclamation, "*Here*?" which outlines the speaker's strong reaction to the current situation. The startled tone of disbelief in their voice calls for a slightly less conventional translation of the further statement because breaches of conventions may pragmatically reinforce the speaker's utterance, enabling the

[15] The formatting of the source text has been retained in order for the emphatic exclamation "*Here*?" to appear noticeable.

translator to emphasize the strangeness of the situation. Therefore, it is possible that the translator dismissed the standard epistemic expression *sigurno* ('certainly') as unsuitable and replaced it by a less conventional solution, namely the non-modal structure *kladim se* ('I bet').

The remaining shifts in the means of expressing modality result from translating the verb by an adjective, a particle, and a lexical verb. Owing to the small number of such examples (2, 2, and 1, respectively), I will exclude them from a more thorough qualitative examination.

It is worth noting that the difference between the two genres regarding *must* also exists at the syntactic level. While the legal corpus abounds in passive voice constructions, these are sporadic in the literary corpus. All modal statements from the legal corpus are expressed in the present tense. This might be because, as Felici puts it (2012: 54), the language of law is meant to be "constantly speaking." In the literary corpus, on the other hand, *must* is used (usually in the perfect infinitive) in nearly half of the cases to indicate some past event.

4.2.3. Should – legal corpus

The analysis identified the modal verb *trebati* as the most common option chosen to translate the modal verb *should* in the legal corpus. This outcome comes as no surprise, since *trebati* is the most common translation of *should* across all registers. In the target language text, frequent use of the conditional form of *trebati* ('trebalo bi') stands out, making up 46% of the total cases and 59% of the cases where *should* is translated as *trebati*. Even though this thesis does not treat conditionals as statements that represent a shift in modal strength at the formal level, it should nevertheless be noted that conditional forms may, at a pragmatic level, increase the tentativeness of a statement and soften it to a certain extent. This fact is particularly important to emphasize in light of a contrastive analysis of *should* and its semantic counterpart *ought to*, whose results will be presented in Section 4.2.5. In the legal corpus, *should* is encountered exclusively in priority statements. Further insight into the meanings of the provisions containing s*hould* reveals that this modal verb, for the most part, appears in the provisions that impose a requirement, followed by those that impose obligation in the narrow sense. In a smaller number of instances, *should* is used to give authorization (20), which has to do with the freedom granted to an agent by law to act in a particular situation in a particular manner (Matković 2022: 26), as illustrated in the following example:

(20) (ST) *The Management Board **should** have the necessary powers to establish the budget, check its implementation, draw up internal rules, ensure coherence with Community policies, adopt the Centre's financial regulation in accordance with the provisions of the Financial Regulation applicable to the general budget of the European Communities (4), hereinafter referred to as the 'Financial Regulation', and appoint the director following a parliamentary hearing of the selected candidate.*

(TT) *Upravni odbor **treba** imati potrebne ovlasti za utvrđivanje proračuna, provjeru njegove provedbe, izradu internih pravila, osiguranje koherentnosti s politikama Zajednice, donošenje Financijske uredbe Centra u skladu s odredbama Financijske uredbe koja se primjenjuje na opći proračun Europskih zajednica (4) (dalje u tekstu: "Financijska uredba"), te za imenovanje direktora nakon što se odabrani kandidat sasluša u Europskom parlamentu.*

In a considerable number of instances, *should* appears in a subordinate clause, which is another similarity between this modal verb and *must*. This observation can be explained by the fact that *should* is mostly used to establish requirements.

(21) (ST) *As regards the limitation of the restructuring costs, the Restructuring Guidelines indicate in point 23 that the restructuring aid **should** be limited to cover the costs that are necessary for the restoration of viability.*

(TT) *U vezi s ograničavanjem troškova restrukturiranja, u točki 23. Smjernica o restrukturiranju navodi se da bi potpora za restrukturiranje **trebala** biti ograničena, kako bi obuhvatila troškove neophodne za uspostavljanje održivosti.*

When expressing obligation, *should* is mainly found in a main clause, as shown in example (22).

(22) (ST) *Categories of holdings **should** be officially recognised by the competent authority as Trichinella -free, provided specific conditions are met.*

(TT) *Nadležno tijelo službeno proglašava gospodarstva kao gospodarstva slobodna od trihineloze, ako su ispunjeni posebni uvjeti.*

To sum up, the modal verb *should* is typically found in main clauses, which are mostly unconditional in both the source and target languages. It appears adjacent to dynamic main verbs

expressed in the active voice. The subject of such clauses is usually inanimate. Take a look at the following example, which comprises all the previously mentioned features.

(23) (ST) *National law **should** provide for a maximum duration for such exclusions*.
(TT) *U nacionalnom pravu **trebalo bi** predvidjeti maksimalno trajanje takvog isključenja.*

With regard to shifts in the strength of this modal verb, a total of four examples are present. In all of them, the modal strength is reinforced, shifting from weak obligation to strong obligation (*morati*). The modal verb *should* undergoes this type of shift less frequently than *must*. One likely explanation for this is that *should* lacks a contextual complexity similar to that arising with *must* (see Section 4.2.1.), which stems from the fact that *must* is often difficult to distinguish semantically from the modal verb *shall* since both verbs express strong obligation, sharing the same semantic slot. *Should*, on the other hand, is virtually the only item intended for expressing weak obligation, considering that its semantic counterpart *ought to* is uncommon in legal discourse. Since its meaning is more straightforward, occupying its separate slot, the translator does not usually have to consider polysemy, which makes it easier for them to decide on a translation solution. This observation may account for the lower frequency of shifts in the modal strength of *should* than is the case with *must* in the legal corpus.

All the shifts in modal strength are determined either by the context (the source of obligation and/or the likelihood of actualization of a situation that is claimed to be possible or necessary) in which the verb is embedded or by linguistic markers that reinforce its strength, i.e., the lexical items that constitute the syntactic environment of the modal verb in a sentence. Take a look at the following example.

(24) (ST) *Research grant agreements set out the conditions under which beneficiaries' cost statements **should** include a certificate issued by an independent auditor.*
(TT) *Ugovorima o bespovratnim sredstvima za istraživanja propisani su uvjeti pod kojima korisnički troškovnici **moraju** sadržavati potvrdu koju je izdao neovisni revizor.*

First of all, it is observable that the source of this provision is an institutional rule, which by definition alludes to strongly binding forces relating to laws. Furthermore, the rule is embedded in the contextual framework of agreements. The agreements specified in the provision, as can be inferred from the context, function as a type of contract, which is reflected in the Croatian translation: *ugovor*. Even though agreements are, strictly speaking, less binding than contracts,

which do not allow making exceptions and must be strictly adhered to, they still stipulate that an action, typically formal in nature, be executed in order for some effect to take place. Another possible reason for the reinforced strength of the modal verb in the target text has to do with a lexical factor. The translator chose the term *ugovor* to render the word *agreement*. This term, being the closest equivalent of the term *contract*, indicates the seriousness of the obligation imposed on the addressee, who in this case must comply with the order; hence, non-compliance with the obligation is not an option. The previous observation accords with the first of the two main factors that affect the strength of deontic expressions, according to Depreatere and Verhulst (2008): the impossibility of non-compliance, which may have led the translator to break from the norm, relying on the assessment that both the contextual and lexical frameworks allowed them to employ a more forceful expression.

The following example has to do with contextual enrichment at the sentence level.

(25) (ST) *However, consumer rights must be protected and where existing direct debit mandates have unconditional refund rights, such rights* ***should*** *be maintained.*
(TT) *Međutim, prava potrošača* ***moraju*** *biti zaštićena, i ako postojeća ovlaštenja za izravno terećenje obuhvaćaju prava na bezuvjetan povrat novčanih sredstava, ta prava moraju biti sačuvana.*

The provision given above states that consumer rights *must* be protected, meaning that these represent an umbrella category that encompasses, among others, the right to an unconditional refund to consumers. Since consumer protection as such requires strict compliance, this consequently applies to the protection of all individual rights belonging to consumers. In other words, the strong obligation framework denoted by *must* embeds the weak obligation expressed by *should*, allowing the translator to take the entire statement as strongly binding. Knežević and Brdar (2011) support the previous explanation.

The final instance of this type of shift involves a linguistic marker that increases the strength of the modal verb.

(26) (ST) *The polluter* ***should*** *be obliged to pay for the proven real pollution he is responsible for.*
(TT) *Onečišćivač* ***mora*** *platiti za dokazano stvarno onečišćenje za koje je on odgovoran.*

In this example, the adjective *obliged* acts, though not in strict terms, as an emphasizer that puts the addressee under obligation to act in the prescribed manner with no possibility of disobeying the order and thereby strengthens the obligation expressed by the modal verb *should*, shifting it from the zone of weak obligation to that of strong obligation. Therefore, the adjective is omitted in the target text, and its strength is transferred to the modal verb. This transfer additionally produces a more economical translation.

Shifts in the means of expressing modality are expressed in a two-fold manner in the legal corpus. The first one, which numbers nine example sentences, involves translating *should* by the modal expression *biti potrebno*. This type of shift is exemplified in (27).

(27) (ST) *Note: If the loan has had multiple transfers, this* ***should*** *be the last date transferred to special servicing.*
(TT) *Napomena: Ako je bilo više prijenosa kredita,* ***potrebno je*** *navesti posljednji datum prijenosa u posebno servisiranje.*

A cogent explanation for the above shift lies in the semantic equivalence of the modal verb *trebati* ('should') and the modal expression *biti potrebno* ('to be necessary'). This shift only has to do with changing the grammatical category of the means of expressing modality, whereas the meaning remains stable. The modal expression in question appears frequently in Croatian legal texts, and legislative drafters do not question its usage as a legitimate translation option. What stands out as intriguing is that this translation solution may not be completely arbitrary. In this regard, out of a total of nine sentences that involve *biti potrebno*, as many as seven of them have some conditional meaning in the source text (out of a total of nine sentences with a conditional connotation in the SLT), expressed by *if*, *where*, and *in the case*. The modal verb always appears in an inverted main clause preceded by a subordinate clause and separated from it by a comma. Furthermore, in eight of those nine sentences, the main verb is used in the passive voice, accounting for roughly one-third of all occurrences of the main verb in the passive voice in the corpus.

Omission of the modal verb is another translation technique that causes shifts in the means of expressing modality in the target language text. Five examples of this type are found in the corpus sentences. In each of them, *should* is translated by the present indicative. Take a look at (28).

(28) (ST) *Where appropriate, on a case-by-case basis, relevant monitoring data from substances with analogous use and exposure patterns or analogous properties* ***should*** *also be considered.*

(TT) *Ako je prikladno, od slučaja do slučaja razmatraju se i relevantni podaci praćenja tvari s analognom upotrebom i obrascima izloženosti ili analognim svojstvima.*

One plausible explanation for (28) lies in the fact that the present indicative indicates both strong and weak obligations (Šarčević 2000). Legislative drafters have no issue with this type of usage. Nonetheless, from a pragmatic perspective, this could be problematic because of the breadth of meaning the present indicative comes with. Given that it is usually used with modal verbs of strong obligation, primarily *shall*, it may leave the impression that it expresses a strong obligation even when employed to translate weak obligation statements, which goes against the principle of clarity that has been championed by legislative drafters. Its use may thus significantly expand the semantic scope of a proposition. For the sake of precision, it is preferable that the verb intended exclusively for weak obligation statements be used (*trebati*).

4.2.4. Should – literary corpus

The results reveal that the most common translation solution employed to render *should* in the literary corpus is the modal verb *trebati*. When it comes to the semantic profile of this modal verb, the analysis identified priority flavor as the most frequent one, accounting for 70.76% of the total semantic readings. The second most common flavor is epistemic flavor. It appears in 24.61% of the example sentences. The remaining sentences (4.61%) involve formulaic expressions, which have no real modal meaning. These findings are consistent with the fact that *should,* as pointed out by Collins (2009: 44), is used primarily in [priority][16] statements and secondarily in epistemic ones. Leech et al. (2009) further support Collins's proposition, claiming that *should* is becoming increasingly monosemous in modern English as its deontic meaning continues to outpace its epistemic meaning. The results obtained can be considered credible because, unlike legal discourse, where deontic flavor prevails because of the very nature of legal texts, literary discourse may give one more objective results regarding the frequency of particular meanings, since it offers a much broader scope of reference within which different semantic

[16] Collins uses a categorization that involves the synonymous concept of deontic modality.

worlds arise. Another peculiarity that stands out is the use of the conditional form of the verb *trebati* ('trebalo bi') in the target text (more than 70% of the cases).

Overall, the analysis of the modal verb *should* demonstrated relatively compatible results throughout the two corpora regarding the two types of shifts in modality. The literary texts are only slightly ahead in terms of the number and percentage of these shifts. It should be noted that the semantic breadth of literary texts enables one to observe more systematically the different contextual frameworks within which a translation is located and by which it is affected. While legal texts naturally come with a fixed semantic framework that indicates strong, institutionally determined obligation, no such framework is predefined in literary texts, which broadens their semantic scope. Take a look at example (29).

(29) (ST) *Or that the government* ***should*** *have somehow foreseen the freak hurricane in the West Country that had caused so much damage to both people and property?* (HBP 2)
(TT) *Ili da je vlada nekako* ***morala*** *predvidjeti posve neočekivani uragan u jugozapadnoj Engleskoj koji je nanio veliku štetu ljudima i imovini?* (Cro. 7)

In order to explain the shift occurring in example (29), I will again consult the rules for the classification of modal strength proposed by Verhulst et al. (2012). Following their criteria, we arrive at the following: if the first criterion, stating that non-compliance is impossible, does not apply because it is still possible to fail to fulfill an obligation (as indeed happened in [29]), modal strength depends on the second criterion, which relates to the impact of the potential consequences of such non-fulfillment. This, in turn, is determined by a range of contextual factors, including those relating to power (the addressee-authority relation), the social relations (e.g., equality or superiority) between the discourse participants, and, as is the case with (29), the severity of the consequences ensuing in case of non-compliance. Consequently, the obligation in (29) is strict because a failure to comply with it results in a life-threatening situation affecting people's health, safety, and property (finances). The translator therefore decided to strengthen the modal verb in order to highlight the significance of the event. It is interesting to observe the translator's consistency in such contexts. She again adhered to the rule and reinforced the strength of the verb in another example sentence that involved a life-threatening situation, as shown in (30):

(30) (ST) *We **should** put out your house (...)* (HBP 606)
(TT) ***Moramo** ugasiti požar (...)* (Cro. 485)

As can be seen, the sentence given above depicts an event with potentially fatal consequences.

Most of the remaining examples found in the corpus do not exhibit such contextual strength. Of the remaining three shifts in modal strength, the first is caused by a lexical factor, as seen in (31).

(31) (ST) *But he is determined that Draco **should** try first.* (HBP 34)
(TT) *Ali čvrsto je odlučio da Dračo **mora** pokušati.* (Cro. 33)

In this example, the verb *should* gains strength in the target language text because of the presence of the preceding adjective *determined*. In these types of constructions, *should* is usually found in a subordinate clause, where it appears with little discernible modal meaning of its own. It goes without saying that determination does not seek to allow any scenario other than the desired one to happen.

The final example sentence involving a shift in modal strength is specific in that the verb's strength is reduced in the target language text. Moreover, its flavor shifts from necessity to possibility. By way of illustration, consider example (32).

(32) (ST) *I thought this evening we **should** just go over the things we've done so far, because it's the last meeting before the holidays and there's no point starting anything new right before a three-week break —* (OoF 453–454)
(TT) *Mislio sam da bismo večeras **mogli** ponoviti sve što smo dosad radili, jer nam je ovo posljednji sastanak prije praznika i nema smisla da počinjemo nešto novo kad nas čeka trotjedna pauza...* (Cro. Ch. 21)

In contrast to the previously mentioned examples, which depict situations that foster a sense of urgency and hence meet the criteria for a strong modality reading, example (32) fits a third criterion set forth by Verhulst et al. (2012) for determining the degrees of modal strength. According to this criterion, the consequences of non-compliance "affect other factors than health or finances, such as work-related or personal issues (e.g., moral principles, appointments)." Therefore, the obligation imposed in (32) is weak since the sentence features a conversation between close friends, and the consequences of failing to carry out the action do not extend far

beyond the scope of the action itself. It is more about a proposal than the need to perform the action, as evidenced by using the verb *think* in the past simple tense, which is used when one wants to make a suggestion in a polite manner. Furthermore, as Huddleston & Pullum (2002: 175) contend, the verb *should* tends more toward expressing deontic possibility than obligation.

In the literary corpus, shifts in the means of expressing modality most often result from using non-modal constructions, as seen in example (33).

(33) (ST) *"Yes, but still," said Tonks, who seemed perfectly untroubled by this piece of information. "You* ***should*** *get out of the cold."* (HBP 246)
(TT) *"Da, ali ipak," odvrati Tonks, koja čini se nije bila nimalo uznemirena tom informacijom, "****bilo bi dobro*** *da se makneš s hladnoće."* (Cro. 200)

This is not unexpected, considering that literary translation involves a great deal of creativity in rendering the source code into the target language. Non-modal translations are challenging to describe systematically because they involve a multitude of syntactic, semantic, stylistic, and other factors. It is possible to display some of its characteristics, however. For example, when translated by a non-modal construction, the verb *should* appears in subordinate clauses in 71% of the cases, exceeding by a wide margin the overall presence (32%) of *should* in subordinate clauses throughout the literary corpus. A subordinate clause builds on the content of the main one; therefore, it is not unexpected that *should*, bearing in mind possible clumsiness that may arise as a result of verbatim translation, is often omitted in the target language text, as seen in the example below:

(34) (ST) *If he had not been so worried about Hagrid, he would have felt sorry for her — but if one of them was to be ousted out of a job, there could be only one choice for Harry as to who* ***should*** *remain.* (OoF 552)
(TT) *Da nije bio tako zabrinut za Hagrida, žalio bi je - no ako je jedno od njih dvoje trebalo ostati bez posla, Harry je znao za čiji ostanak navija.* (Cro. Ch. 25)

Should is placed at the very end of the sentence, and the decisions made before the translator reached it might be the cause of its shifted form or its complete exclusion.

Omission is the second most common translation choice that causes shifts in the means of expressing modality. This strategy is applied where the retention of the modal verb would carry no pragmatic importance for the message to be conveyed; therefore, the style of expression takes

primacy over the semantic meaning of the translated piece. Take a look at the following examples.

(35) (ST) *I was thinking that — maybe the time's come when we* ***should*** *just — just do it ourselves.* (OoF 325)

(TT) *(...) pomislila sam da je... da je možda došlo vrijeme da jednostavno... da jednostavno nešto sami učinimo.* (Cro. Ch. 15)

(36) (ST) *You* ***should*** *definitely wear it in front of Fred and George.* (HBP 338)

(TT) *Svakako si to objesi oko vrata i prošeci pred Fredom i Georgeom.* (Cro. 273)

Not only does there not exist a context that would prompt strict adherence to the source text wording by depicting scenes that may evoke a sense of seriousness, but the syntactic environment also requires that the modal verb be left out of the translation. In the first example, the adverb *maybe* plays a key role. It expresses probability, rendering *trebati* unnecessary. In the second example, the adverb *definitely* acts as an intensifier that accentuates the necessity for the action to be carried out, rendering the verb *trebati* redundant.

The second most common case of omitting the modal verb is motivated by grammatical reasons. See example (37).

(37) (ST) *"Oh, she survived," said Dumbledore, reseating himself behind his desk and indicating that Harry* ***should*** *sit down too.* (HBP 311)
(TT) *Ponovo se smjestio za radni stol i rukom pozvao Harryja da i on sjedne.* (Cro. 172)

Palmer (1990: 189, as cited in Imre 2010: 452) observes the redundancy of *should* in such instances (*It surprises me that Eileen should be surprised.*). All *should*-cases with a similar construction (*determined, order, command, urge, demand, ask, desire, favor, insist, require, propose, it's odd/ strange, etc.* + *should*) do not require a direct translation and may be translated, for example, by indicative or imperative forms; the modal verb thus disappears in the target text (Imre 2010: 452). These uses of *should* are referred to as putative *should* (indicating surprise or disbelief) and the mandative subjunctive (indicating obligation).

The remaining examples of shifts in the means of expression include translating *should*

by a lexical verb, a phrase, an adverb, and a modal adjective. Due to their small number, I will not subject them to further analysis.

4.2.5. Ought to – legal corpus

The study results reveal that the modal verb *trebati* is the most prevalent solution employed to translate the modal verb *ought to* in the legal corpus. In all of its occurrences in this corpus, *ought to* carries a priority flavor. It most often communicates obligation, though more rarely than *should*. The results of the analysis of *ought to* are most notable for shifts in its modal strength, which occur in 21% of all example sentences where this modal verb appears, standing in sharp contrast to the relatively low frequency of the same type of shift regarding *should*. In all such cases, the meaning of *ought to* shifts from weak obligation (*ought to*) to strong obligation (*morati*). Additionally, this verb is translated by a conditional form (*trebalo bi*/*moralo bi*) in approximately 15% of the cases. The verb *should*, by comparison, is translated by a conditional form in nearly 50% of the cases. According to these findings, *should* is arguably weaker and more tentative than *ought to*. Looking into their occurrences in the literary corpus (which will be addressed thoroughly in Section 4.2.6.), one will notice that *ought to* and *should* have roughly the same frequency of shifts in modal strength, which speaks in favor of the claim about their interchangeability. However, as outlined above, when comparing their occurrences in the legal corpus, *ought to* undergoes as many as 14 shifts (21%) in strength, compared to only four shifts (6%) observed in the case of *should*. The question arises as to what causes this discrepancy, which exists only in the context of the translation of legal texts and which suggests that *ought to* is substantially stronger than *should*. One possible explanation may have to do with legal conventions. For example, Hoffman (1993) contends that *ought to* expresses a stronger obligation when referring to public and moral behavior. Myhill (1996) asserts that, in contrast to *should*, which is associated with individual feelings and attitudes, *ought to* is used in relation to social agreements or conventions. Along similar lines, Traugott and Dasher (2002: 138) argue that, when used deontically, *ought to* most often has to do with a moral and social duty imposed on an individual. Both verbs have a noteworthy number of occurrences in the source text where they appear adjacent to a lexical verb expressed in the passive voice, as shown in the following examples.

(38) (ST) *The role of groups **should** be clarified and recognised.*

(ST) *Ulogu skupina **trebalo bi** pojasniti i priznati.*

(39) (ST) *It **ought to** be ensured that ships comply with the reporting requirements in force under these systems.*

(TT) ***Treba** osigurati da brodovi ispunjavaju zahtjeve o izvješćivanju koji su na snazi prema tim sustavima.*

The passive form can pragmatically weaken modal strength because it removes the directness of the request made by the deontic source. Nevertheless, it seems that passive constructions do not affect the strength of *ought to* in a significant way, as it remains relatively stable throughout the corpus. It appears that the translator is guided not by the syntactic or semantic environment of the verb but by the general conventions, according to which *ought to* has a more objective force and conveys a sense of strictness. This will prompt the translator to draw a distinction between these two modal verbs and render them differently.

Another noteworthy aspect is the frequency of these two verbs in legal discourse. *Should* figures prominently in legal texts, while *ought to* appears to be marginal in this context. Its rarity could be another reason why it is stronger than *should* in the legal corpus; it may leave a stronger impression on the translator when encountering it. This line of reasoning leads to the conclusion that the presence of *ought to* may prompt the translator to use a stronger expression when translating this modal verb.

Given the above, it is all the more surprising that o*ught to* mostly appears in texts that do not have regulatory or mandatory force and are not legally binding. In the present paper's corpus, *ought to* is found in opinions in as many as 70% of the cases. As far as other non-binding types of EU texts are concerned, its presence in recommendations stands out. It is uncommon in legally binding types of documents, such as regulations, directives, and decisions. This observation explains the following atypical phenomenon encountered in the legal corpus: *ought to* indicates a time in the past in roughly 40% of the cases, mainly as part of a *have + pp* construction. This is quite atypical for the language of the law, which, as has been mentioned, is "constantly speaking" and, as a rule, refers to present time, which is well-suited for imposing obligations. Nevertheless, judging by the types of documents in which this modal verb appears, it is clear that it only plays a subsidiary role in legal discourse.

Shifts in the modal strength of the verb *ought to* are, in addition to the reasons stated above, caused mainly by a contextual framework and, in a smaller number of instances, linguistic markers. Approximately half of them fall under the criterion according to which failure to fulfill an obligation may endanger people's health, safety, or material/financial condition. The following example illustrates this type of influence on translation.

(40) (ST) *As regards, in the first place, the request for reparation for the personal damage, both material and non-material, suffered by the appellant in person and the heirs and successors of Alessandro Missir Mamachi di Lusignano, the Civil Service Tribunal, after finding that it did not have jurisdiction to hear and determine that aspect of the action, as it came within the jurisdiction of the General Court,* ***ought to*** *have referred it to the General Court, in accordance with Article 8(2) of Annex I to the Statute of the Court of Justice.*

(TT) *Prvo, kada je riječ o zahtjevu za popravljanje osobne štete, bilo imovinske ili neimovinske, žalitelja osobno i pravnih sljednika Alessandra Missira Mamachija di Lusignana, Službenički sud je, nakon što je utvrdio da nije nadležan za provođenje postupka i donošenje odluke o tom aspektu tužbe koji je u nadležnosti Općeg suda, isti* ***morao*** *uputiti Općem sudu sukladno članku 8. stavku 2.*

In about 15% of the example sentences containing a shift, the role of a linguistic marker that reinforces the strength of the modal expression comes into play. Example (41) illustrates this type of influence on the translator.

(41) (ST) *Special national provisions on the activity of mutual societies and on monitoring by supervisory authorities* ***ought*** *to apply* ***fully*** *to mutual societies.*

(TT) *Posebna nacionalna pravila vezana uz aktivnosti uzajamnih društava i kontrolu nadzornih tijela* ***moraju*** *se* ***bez ograničenja*** *primjenjivati i na europska uzajamna društva.*

The question arises as to how to account for the remaining 35% of example sentences where neither a forceful contextual framework nor the influence of a linguistic marker that would reinforce the modal verb was noticed. One plausible explanation relates to the fact that the source of obligation in all those sentences is a rule. Further factors may be the previously mentioned rarity of the verb *ought to* in legal discourse and its objective nature, which may influence the

translator to opt for a translation solution different from those commonly reserved for the verb *should*.

When it comes to shifts in the means of expressing modality, it may be surprising that these are more frequent in the legal corpus. Examples were found that involved using modal expressions and omissions. The modal expression *biti potrebno* is observed in four sentences where *ought to* is translated by a modal expression, while in the only remaining case, the modal expression *biti dužan* is used. The following example shows the type of shift mentioned.

(42) (ST) *Suitable wood assortments* ***ought to*** *be used physically rather than to serve as a fuel.*

(TT) *Prikladan izbor drvnih proizvoda* ***potrebno je*** *koristiti fizički, a ne da oni služe kao gorivo.*

The first shift can be explained by drawing a connection between *ought to* and *should*. Their semantic similarity and the verb *trebati* as their primary translation equivalent lead to the shifting of this modal verb to a related modal expression: *biti potrebno* ('to be necessary'). As previously stated, there is no semantic difference between *trebati* and *biti potrebno*. They differ only in form, i.e., grammatical category.

There are also two instances of omission of the modal verb in the target language text. In one of them, it is translated by the present indicative, and in the other, the modal construction is entirely omitted, as shown in (43).

(43) *(ST) The confidentiality rules established by Article 10 prevented the Commission from acting, as it* ***ought to*** *have done, in a 'thorough, prompt, impartial and detailed way' in order to help the applicant to clear up the theft of allowances allegedly suffered on 16 November 2010.*

(TT) Naime, pravila o povjerljivosti utvrđena tim člankom spriječila su Komisiju da postupi "temeljito, brzo, nepristrano i detaljno" kako bi pomogla u rasvjetljavanju krađe emisijskih jedinica koju je on navodno pretrpio 16. studenoga 2010.

The translator might have concluded that the modal construction was redundant in this context because the behavior stated in the provision ought to be self-evident.

4.2.6. Ought to – literary corpus

The results demonstrate that the modal verb *trebati* is the most common lexical item used to translate the modal verb *ought to* in the literary corpus. The analysis identified priority flavor as the most common one, accounting for 87% of the total modal meanings. The remaining modal items have epistemic flavor. These results accord with the previously mentioned semantic proximity between *ought to* and *should* (which tends toward priority flavor).

The analysis of *ought to* demonstrated relatively consistent results across both corpora in terms of shifts in the means of expressing modality. However, a discrepancy occurs when it comes to shifts in the strength of this modal verb, with the legal corpus containing three times as many of these as the literary corpus (see Section 4.2.5. for an explanation). Furthermore, the conditional form of *trebati* ('trebalo bi') in the target language texts appears in 70% of the cases, matching *should* from the literary corpus in this respect. Therefore, there is no difference in strength between *should* and *ought to* in the literary corpus; it emerges exclusively in the legal corpus.

Within the epistemic modal group, the use of the subject (i.e., the addressee) in the third-person singular form can be singled out as the central one, paralleling the corpus examples of *should* in this respect. However, here the subject is typically impersonal (*it, which, there)*. *Ought to* also appears in the second-person singular, although this usage is comparatively rare. No instances of the first-person singular or plural were noted. Within the priority modal group, the use of the subject in the third-person singular is slightly more prevalent, followed by a considerable number of instances where the subject takes the second-person singular form. A noteworthy number of examples are found with the first-person plural, while the third-person plural is moderately less frequent. Present-time reference is prevalent, while past reference is encountered in approximately 20% of the cases (with the construction *ought to have + pp*). Future-time reference is found exclusively in epistemic statements, as illustrated in example (44):

(44) (ST) *Which, now I think of it,* ***ought*** *to be some time later today.* (HBP 79)

(TT) *Što bi se, kad malo bolje razmislim,* ***trebalo*** *dogoditi u kasnijem dijelu današnjeg dana.* (Cro. 68)

In such instances, the modal verb *ought to* is always translated by the conditional form of *trebati* (*trebalo bi*).

With regard to shifts in the strength of the modal verb, a total of five sentences involving one were found. In all of them, the strength shifts from weak obligation (*ought to*) to strong obligation (*morati*). Four of them fall within the category of priority modality, and one falls within that of epistemic modality. This type of shift occurs about as frequently here as in the sentences containing *should*. By comparison, *ought to* from the legal corpus numbers about three times as many shifts in strength as *ought to* from the literary corpus. In the statements that involve priority *ought to*, strong modality situations, i.e., those in which an agent is under a high degree of obligation, which in case of failure may result in consequences that pose a threat to human life, are found rarely (in approximately 18% of the cases). Most of the cases have to do with a weak or intermediate modal strength, where obligation arises from a request that is subject-oriented or where the source (the person imposing obligation) is in a hierarchically superior position to other discourse participants. For example, in the weak modality domain, the speaker mainly uses *ought to* to express their opinion or give advice, as seen in the following example.

(45) (ST) *Narcissa, I think we* ***ought to*** *hear what Bellatrix is bursting to say; it will save tedious interruptions.* (HBP 25)
(TT) *Narcissa,* ***mislim*** *da bismo trebali poslušati to što Bellatrix očito silno želi reći, da se poštedimo daljnjih zamornih upadica.* (Cro. 26)

All of the priority shifts in strength are determined by at least one of the following factors proposed by Verhulst et al. (2012) (in some instances, more than one is present): the gravity of non-compliance (46), the party that is meant to benefit from the fulfillment of the obligation (46), formulaic language (47, 48), the social relations between the discourse participants (47), and institutional rules (47, 48). Consider each of the examples in turn.

(46) (ST) *I returned to Hogwarts intending to keep an eye upon him, something I should have done in any case, given that he was alone and friendless, but which, already, I felt I* ***ought to*** *do for others' sake as much as his.* (HBP 276)
(TT) *Vratio sam se u Hogwarts s odlukom da ću ga držati na oku, što bih ionako učinio, s*

obzirom na to da je bio sam i bez prijatelja, ali već mi se onda činilo da to ***moram*** *činiti ne samo radi njegove sigurnosti, nego i radi sigurnosti drugih ljudi.* (Cro. 223)

In (46), the obligation to act originates from a subjective (discourse-internal) source, but the fulfillment of the obligation benefits not the source but some other person(s). Therefore, it may be deemed necessary to actualize a situation when the good of other people is at stake. Furthermore, the consequences of failing to do so in the case of example (46) may have a negative impact on other people's safety.

(47) (ST) *First years* ***ought to*** *know that the forest in the grounds is out of bounds to students — and a few of our older students ought to know by now too*. (OoF 210)
(TT) *Prvoškolci* ***moraju*** *znati da je učenicima zabranjen pristup u šumu u sklopu perivoja - a to je dosad trebao naučiti i pokoji naš stariji učenik.* (Cro. Ch. 11)

In (47), as many as three factors give rise to the strengthening of the modal verb in the target text. The first of those factors is the formulaic nature of the statement. It is pretty much a set expression frequently uttered by school personnel. The second factor is the social relationship between the discourse participants. The lecturer is in a superior position to their students, which makes their statements pragmatically stronger. The final factor is an institutional rule: the institution prohibits first-grade students from accessing the forest, and they must respect the prohibition. The following example also demonstrates the institutional rule factor:

(48) (ST) *You'll want to know which subjects you* ***ought to*** *take, I suppose?* (OoF 662)
(TT) *Sigurno vas zanima koje biste predmete* ***morali*** *polagati? upita ona, nešto glasnije nego prije.* (Cro. Ch. 29)

It stands to reason that students are to take subjects to pass grades; hence, non-compliance is not an option.

In the following example, the only factor that strengthens the modal verb is the formulaic nature of the statement. When translating set expressions, the translator will rarely adhere to a verbatim replication of the source text but will adapt it to equivalent wording in the target language.

(49) (ST) *And I* ***ought to*** *tell you now, Potter, that I do not accept students into my N.E.W.T. classes unless they have achieved 'Exceeds Expectations' or higher at Ordinary*

Wizarding Level. (OoF 662–663)

(TT) *I tu* ***moram*** *istaknuti, Potteru, da ja na satove za OČI ne primam učenike koji na ispitu za ČAS nisu dobili bar ocjenu "iznad očekivanja".* (Cro. Ch. 29)

The final example carries an epistemic flavor.

(50) (ST) *Harry felt sure that there* ***ought to*** *be a security person there, sure that their absence was an ominous sign, and his feeling of foreboding increased as they passed through the golden gates to the lifts.* (OoF 769)

(TT) *Harry je bio siguran da bi se tu* ***morao*** *nalaziti čuvar i da njegova odsutnost ne sluti na dobro.* (Cro. Ch. 34)

In this example, semantic amplification occurs. The presence of a lexical marker, namely the adjective *siguran* ('sure'), does not leave room for tentativeness that would otherwise be present. The certainty expressed in the statement tends toward strong (logical) necessity, in which domain the main modal item is the verb *morati* ('must').

In the literary corpus, all but one of the shifts in the means of expressing modality are caused by using a non-modal construction. Here, there is a level of systematicity not found in the translations of the previous two verbs (*must* and *should*). In this regard, one may notice that where the modal verb is translated by a non-modal construction, it is used to make a recommendation. Here, *ought to* does not express obligation but rather advisability, tending more toward the modal zone of possibility than that of necessity. It is characteristic of such examples that the translator uses phrasemic wording that implies the desirability of the act being considered. The wording *biti dobro* is used twice (*bilo bi dobro* and *bolje da*) and the wording *ne bi bilo loše* once, where the translator employs modulation, i.e., "a variation through a change of viewpoint, of perspective and very often of category of thought" (Vinay and Darbelnet 1958, as cited in Newmark 1988: 88). The following example shows this type of shift.

(51) (ST) *"We* ***ought to*** *double back for a bit, just to make sure we're not being followed!" Moody shouted.* (OoF 57)

(TT) *"Bilo bi dobro da se neko vrijeme vraćamo istim putem kojim smo došli, da budemo sigurni kako nas nitko ne prati!" zaurla Moody.* (Cro. Ch. 3)

In the remaining examples in which a non-modal translation is encountered, the verb *ought to* is located in a subordinate clause that acts as a postmodifier. Due to this fact, such a translation would possibly turn out to be clunky if a word-for-word translation solution were employed. See the following example.

(52) (ST) *If you ask me, he's not dangerous unless he's got support, so it's Black we* ***ought to*** *be worrying about.* (HBP 8)
(TT) *Ako mene pitate, opasan je samo ako ima potporu, što znači da nam je sad glavna briga Black.* (Cro. 12–13)

The final example involves omission of the modal verb. Take a look at (53).

(53) (ST) *He did not want to hear what Ron had to say, did not want to hear Ron tell him he had been stupid, or suggest that they* ***ought to*** *go back to Hogwarts*. (OoF 779)
(TT) *Nije htio čuti kako mu Ron govori da je bio glup ili kako mu predlaže da se vrate u Hogwarts*. (Cro. Ch. 34)

In this example, the subjunctive use of the verb *ought to* crops up. As a result, the verb is omitted in the target text. Take notice of the fact that verbs used in the mandative subjunctive can be dropped from the source language without causing any change in meaning: *(...) or suggest that they (ought to) go back to Hogwarts*.

4.2.7. May – legal corpus

The analysis of the sentences containing the modal verb *may* that were extracted from the legal corpus reveals that this modal verb is mainly translated into Croatian by the modal verb *moći*. *May* has a less uniform semantic profile than *must*, *should* and *ought to*, at least in the legal corpus. Even though priority flavor is highly prevalent, appearing in 81% of the cases throughout the corpus, epistemic and dynamic flavors also play a significant role, appearing in 11% and 8% of the cases, respectively. With regard to using *may* in the source language text, a few peculiarities stand out. The first is a high frequency of using *may* to grant authorizations. The typical provision with *may* contains a subject (addressee) that is an institution to which a superior institution grants the right to take further action, in which the former has decision-making

autonomy. This case is shown in (54), where the agent is the Council of the EU and the addressee is the Special Committee.

(54) (ST) *The Special Committee, on the basis of a proposal by the administrator,* ***may*** *decide that additional contributions will be called before the adoption of an amending budget for the operation.*

(TT) *Posebni odbor, na temelju prijedloga administratora,* ***može*** *donijeti odluku da se zatraže dodatni doprinosi prije usvajanja izmjena proračuna za operaciju.*

In a significant number of cases (approximately 25%), the proposition carries some sort of conditional meaning, most commonly expressed using the *if*-clause, but also other linguistic markers such as *where* or set phrases such as *on the condition.* See example (55).

(55) (ST) *Where the competent authorities of a Member State decide, at the express request of the Commission, to initiate or continue judicial proceedings with a view to recovering amounts unduly paid, the Commission* ***may*** *undertake to reimburse the Member State all or part of the judicial costs and costs arising directly from the proceedings, on presentation of documentary evidence, even where the proceedings are unsuccessful.*

(TT) *Ako nadležna tijela države članice na izričiti zahtjev Komisije odluče pokrenuti ili nastaviti sudski postupak u svrhu povrata pogrešno plaćenih iznosa, Komisija* ***može*** *odlučiti državi članici u cijelosti ili djelomično nadoknaditi sudske troškove i troškove koji proizlaze izravno iz postupka, na temelju predočenja dokumentiranih dokaza, čak i ako postupak nije bio uspješan.*

Knežević and Brdar (2011) provide a comparable example, demonstrating the conditionality of provisions in which *may* commonly appears. It could be argued that *may* represents a substitutional force that is exercised on the condition that some previous options succeed or fail, depending on the condition set.

In the epistemic domain, a high occurrence of *may* in subordinate clauses stands out, as does translating this modal verb by the conditional form of the verb *moći* (*moglo bi*). Consider example (56).

(56) (ST) *Member States should communicate any significant infringement of the marketing standards so that other Member States that* ***may*** *be affected can be alerted in an*

appropriate manner.

(TT) *Države članice trebaju obavješćivati o svim značajnim kršenjima tržišnih standarda tako da se na prikladan način mogu upozoriti ostale države članice koje bi* ***mogle biti*** *ugrožene.*

Also, all three examples with a past-time reference (*may have* + *pp*) fall within the realm of epistemic modality and are translated by the adverb *možda.*

(57) (ST) *While the factors mentioned above* ***may*** *indeed have had an impact on the average costs they cannot explain why Union producers had to reduce their prices below their cost of production.*

(TT) *Iako su spomenuti čimbenici* ***možda*** *uistinu utjecali na prosječne troškove, njima se ne može objasniti zašto su proizvođači iz Unije svoje cijene morali smanjiti ispod svog troška proizvodnje.*

In some instances, *may* is used dynamically. Dynamic modals are often on the borderline between a dynamic and an epistemic reading and can only be distinguished from epistemic modals with the help of a more comprehensive context. In such contexts, *may* serves as a more formal means of expressing the dynamic meaning of *can*. This usage of the verb *may* is common in legal discourse. See example (58).

(58) (ST) *This discharge procedure* ***may*** *produce one of two outcomes: the granting or postponement of the discharge.*

(TT) *Postupak davanja razrješnice* ***može*** *imati jedan od sljedeća dva ishoda: davanje razrješnice ili njezino odlaganje.*

There are no shifts in the strength of this modal verb to be found in the legal corpus. One possible explanation for this lies in the relatively narrow semantic scope of *possibility*, which reduces the space available for semantic maneuvering. For instance, within the semantic framework of deontic necessity, there are strong obligation and weak obligation meanings (along with their further nuances). By contrast, if there is such a notion as strong permission and weak permission in the realm of deontic possibility, it is not evident *per se*. Furthermore, it is unlikely that a modal verb expressing possibility would make a shift to necessity; such an occurrence would not only increase the verb's strength but also produce a shift in its modal force. Moreover,

a shift from permission to obligation is highly unlikely for practical reasons. Therefore, I assumed that shifts in the strength of the verbs that express possibility would be less frequent, which has turned out to be correct.

Shifts in the means of expressing modality are slightly more common. However, they are still relatively rare compared to the same type of shift regarding *must* and *should* from the legal corpus. In the latter case, shifts occur approximately three times as frequently as they do in the case of *may*. In the legal corpus, *may* undergoes roughly the same number of shifts in the means of expressing modality as the verb *ought to*. All these shifts are produced in the target language text as a result of using omissions and adverbs. Take a look at the following example.

(59) (ST) *Food-grade acids, alkalies, and salts **may** be used to assist carmelization.*
(TT) *Za pospješavanje karamelizacije upotrebljavaju se kiseline, alkalije i soli primjerene za prehranu.*

In example (59), *may* is again translated by the present indicative. This time, its scope extends to expressing possibility. I have not found a justification for such a translation from legislative drafters. It has already been said that the present indicative can be used to indicate both strong and weak obligations. Judging by (59), there seems to be no issue with using it to communicate permission either.

It is interesting to note the use of the verb *smjeti* in the translation. Even though there are few such examples (2) to draw any general conclusions based on their analysis, indications exist that there might be an underlying pattern regarding their translation. In those examples, the adverb *samo* ('only') accompanies the modal verb, thus narrowing the scope of permission. Example (60) illustrates the previous observation.

(60) (ST) *Flavouring substances with restrictions of use **may** only be added to the listed food categories and under the specified conditions of use.*
(TT) *Aromatične tvari s ograničenjima uporabe **smiju** se dodavati samo navedenim kategorijama hrane i pod navedenim uvjetima uporabe.*

Further insight into similar cases is required regarding the arguably greater strength of *smjeti* in comparison with *moći*.

4.2.8. May – literary corpus

The analysis of the sentences containing the modal verb *may* that were extracted from the literary corpus reveals that this modal verb is mainly translated into Croatian by the adverb *možda* ('maybe', 'perhaps'). Here, as in the case of the verb *must* in the literary corpus, epistemic flavor prevails, which explains such a result. The second most common is priority flavor, while in a smaller number of cases, *may* is used in formulaic constructions whose modal meaning is marginal.

Among other features, the use of *may* in *have + pp* constructions stands out, which accounts for more than a fifth of the total cases and, without exception, involves epistemic judgments. Additionally, the translation options *moći* and *smjeti* are roughly equally prevalent in the priority domain. *Moći* is only slightly ahead in terms of frequency, with *smjeti* following closely. This reflects the difference in comparison to the legal corpus, where *moći* is virtually the only translation item when it comes to modal verbs, while *smjeti* is encountered rarely. I will look at the contexts in which both verbs appear shortly.

A shift in the strength of the modal verb was observed in only two example sentences. In the first, possibility shifts to weak logical necessity, thereby altering not only the flavor but also the force (61).

(61) (ST) *"— by which time, many of you **may** be ready to take your tests," Twycross continued, as though there had been no interruption*. (HBP 382)
(TT) *"(…) što znači da bi mnogi od vas dotad **trebali** bez problema izaći na ispit", nastavio je Twycross kao da ga nitko nije prekinuo*. (Cro. 308)

In the given example, literal translation would not add pragmatic value to the message conveyed. In addition, the degree of probability expressed by *may* in English is comparable to the intuitive strength of the conditional form of *trebati* in Croatian. Furthermore, translating this modal verb as *moći* would introduce a sense of ambiguity because it might not be readily apparent that the sentence is not intended to express a meaning relating to what's permitted, i.e., permission for the students to take their tests.

In the other example, the strength shifts from possibility to strong logical necessity. This marks the greatest degree of shifting that occurred in all the sentences investigated. See example (62).

(62) (ST) *Nymphadora Tonks* ***may*** *need to spend a little time in St. Mungo's, but it seems that she will make a full recovery.* (OoF 822)

(TT) *Nymphadora Tonks će neko vrijeme* ***morati*** *ležati u Svetom Mungu, ali čini se da će se potpuno oporaviti.* (Cro. Ch. 37)

In this sentence, the translator shifted the entire flavor (from epistemic to priority) and strengthened the modal expression in the target text. What can be observed here is that priority in determining the strength of a modal verb is often given to its syntactic and semantic environment. In (62), the translator decided to use the lexical verb *need* (which is remarkably stronger than *may*) as a guide and transfer the translation to the realm of strong obligation.

The most striking difference between the two genres regarding *may* is concerned with shifts in the means of expressing modality. This case is very similar to that of *must* discussed in Section 4.2.2. In both cases, this type of shift is most common within the framework of epistemic modality. This being the case, a translation that would attempt to convey probability by means of *moći* would be conspicuously marked and clumsy in terms of style. Therefore, the translator will usually opt for a more natural and elegant solution, which is an adverb (typically *možda*), as shown in the following example.

(63) (ST) *Black's a known Muggle killer and* ***may*** *be planning to rejoin YouKnow-Who. . . . But of course, you don't even know who YouKnow-Who is!* (HBP 8)

(TT) *Black je otprije poznat kao ubojica bezjaka i* ***možda*** *se planira pridružiti Znate-već-kome... pa da, vi uopće ne znate tko je Znate-već-tko!* (Cro. 12)

Since epistemic modality is rare in legal texts, this is where the difference regarding this kind of modal shift between the two genres arises.

The second most common type of shift in the means of expressing modality involves omission of the modal verb. Consider the following example.

(64) (ST) *"I am not proud . . ." he whispered through his fingers. "I am ashamed of what — of what that memory shows. . . . I think I* ***may*** *have done great damage that day. . . ."* (HBP 490)

(TT) *"Ne ponosim se..." šapne on kroz prste. "Sramim se zbog onoga... što to sjećanje prikazuje...* ***mislim*** *da sam tog dana prouzročio veliku štetu..."* (Cro. 393)

Such cases are characterized by the modal verb almost always appearing together with a lexical verb that, by its nature, expresses a degree of certainty in the statement, relying on semantic enrichment. The vast majority of such examples are epistemic. The main verb is typically stative and relates to thoughts and feelings, such as *think*, *know*, and *feel*. Accordingly, where omission is encountered, the modal verb from the source text mainly appears in a subordinate clause.

The remaining examples include phrasemic expressions and non-modal constructions. Due to their small number (3 and 2, respectively), I will not include them in a more detailed qualitative analysis.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, the general characteristics of the translation of English modal verbs into Croatian in legal and literary texts were analyzed. Emphasis was placed on two types of shifts occurring in the translation process: shifts in the strength of modal verbs and shifts in the means of expressing modality. By examining these shifts, I aimed to find out what had motivated the translator to employ certain translation solutions that had caused a shift in modality and how those solutions reflect the general characteristics of the two genres regarding modality in terms of their syntactic, semantic, and pragmatic features appearing in the translation process.

The results showed that shifts in the strength of the modal verb *must,* which was translated predominantly as *morati*, were more prevalent in the legal corpus. A possible reason for this could be the presence of the strong framework of rules and regulations legal discourse comes with, which allows weaker modal verbs to draw on its strength. Such a framework is not predefined in literary works, which will usually prompt the translator to opt for more straightforward translation solutions. By contrast, shifts in the means of expressing modality were much more common in the literary corpus. They resulted from the high prevalence of epistemic modal verbs in literary discourse. In translating epistemic *must*, using the equivalent modal verb (*morati*) is stylistically marked. This is the reason why the adverb *sigurno* was used in the vast majority of such instances. This adverb was the most common solution employed to translate epistemic *must* in the literary corpus overall. Omission of the modal verb was a very frequent solution in both genres. However, in the case of the legal corpus, it was motivated by the conventions of legal translation, whereas in the literary corpus, the main factor causing it was lexical markers encountered in the syntactic environment of the modal verb, enriching it semantically.

The modal verb *should* extracted from the legal corpus was mostly translated by the conditional form of *trebati* (‘trebalo bi’), carrying a priority flavor. There were fewer shifts in the strength of this modal verb than in the case with *must*. A cogent explanation for this lies in the fact that the verb *should* lacks a contextual complexity similar to that occurring with *must*, which stems from the fact that *must* is difficult to semantically distinguish from the modal verb *shall*, with which it shares the same semantic slot. In the literary corpus, *should* was also translated as *trebati* for the most part, and it was predominantly epistemic. The analysis of this verb

demonstrated relatively compatible results across the two genres of translation regarding modal shifts, with the literary texts being only slightly ahead regarding the number and percentage of the examples involving shifts in modal strength and those in the means of expressing modality.

The findings concerning *ought to* showed that *trebati* was the most common translation solution used to translate the aforementioend modal verb in the legal corpus. It carried a priority flavor. This modal verb stood in stark contrast to *should* regarding shifts in modal strength, undergoing three times as many of these as *should*. *Ought to* was only translated in 15% of the cases by the conditional form of *trebati* ('trebalo bi'). This verb was stronger than *should* only in the legal corpus. This could be explained by taking into account legal conventions, which state that *ought to* is a more objective verb that expresses a stronger obligation when referring to public and moral behavior. Furthermore, its rarity in legal discourse may emphasize the obligation, prompting the translator to translate it using expressions stronger than those normally used to translate *should*. In a significant number of cases, *ought to* was used to refer to some time in the past. However, when it comes to the literary corpus, the difference between *ought to* and *should* disappeared. *Ought to* was translated by the conditional form of *trebati* ('trebalo bi') in approximately 70% of the cases, being identical in that respect to *should.* The results concerning *ought to* in the literary corpus showed that the most common translation solution employed to render this modal verb was *trebati*. It mostly had a priority flavor. The examination of *ought to* produced relatively compatible results across the two genres of translation with regard to shifts in the means of expressing modality.

The modal verb *may* in the legal corpus was translated predominantly as *moći*. *May* had a less uniform semantic profile than the previous three modals regarding the legal corpus, involving a significant percentage of epistemic and dynamic flavors. It typically appeared in the provisions that granted an authorization. No shifts in the strength of *may* were found, possibly because of the narrow semantic scope of *possibility*. The most frequent translation solution employed to translate *may* in the literary corpus was the adverb *možda*. Epistemic *may* prevails here, which accounts for such a result. Translating *may* by the modal construction *može biti da*, which involves a modal verb (*može*), is overly complex. That is why the translator will resort to using *možda*. In the literary corpus, *moći* and *smjeti* are roughly equally common, which is a difference in comparison to the legal corpus, in which *moći* is virtually the only translation item when it comes to modal verbs, while *smjeti* only appears in a negligible number of cases.

Overall, the results of this research showed that shifts in the strength of the analyzed modal verbs were more frequent in the legal corpus, primarily because of the strong framework of rules and regulations legal discourse comes with, in which the modals were embedded. Shifts in the means of expressing modality were more frequent in the literary corpus, primarily because of a high frequency of epistemic modal verbs in this genre. In most cases, translating these verbs by means of an equivalent modal verb is stylistically marked. This had prompted the translator to use other parts of speech in translation. Contextual enrichment of the semantic content provided by lexical markers also played a major role in causing shifts in the means of expressing modality in the literary corpus, while in the legal corpus these shifts were caused mainly by legal conventions.

References

Badurina, Lana. 2020. O modalnosti – s osobitim obzirom na modalne glagole. *Sarajevski filološki susreti* 5. Ur: Palić, Ismail. Bosansko filološko društvo. Sarajevo. 47–60.

Barić, Eugenija & Lončarić, Mijo & Malić, Dragica & Pavešić, Slavko & Peti, Mirko & Zečević, Vesna & Znika, Marija. 1997. *Hrvatska gramatika.* Zagreb: Školska knjiga.

Bassnett, Susan. 2002. *Translation Studies* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.

Belaj, Branimir & Tanacković Faletar, Goran. 2017. *Kognitivna gramatika hrvatskoga jezika. Knjiga druga. Sintaksa jednostavne rečenice*. Zagreb: Disput.

Biber, Douglas & Johansson, Stig & Leech, Geoffrey & Conrad, Susan & Finegan, Edward. 1999. *Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English*. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Biber, Douglas & Conrad, Susan & Leech, Geoffrey. 2002. *Longman student grammar of spoken and written English.* Harlow: Pearson Education.

Bybee, Joan L. & Fleischman, Suzanne. 1995. Modality in grammar and discourse: An introductory essay. In: Bybee, Joan L. & Fleischman, Suzanne (Eds.), *Modality in grammar and discourse*, 1–14. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Carter, Ronald & McCarthy, Michael. 2006. *Cambridge Grammar of English: A Comprehensive Guide*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Collins, Peter. 2009. *Modals and Quasi-modals in English*. Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Cruse, David Alan. 2004. *Meaning in Language: An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics* (2nd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Declerck, Renaat. 1991. *A Comprehensive Descriptive Grammar of English*. Tokyo: Kaitakusha.

Depraetere, Ilse & Reed, Susan. 2006. Mood and modality in English, In: Aarts, Bas & McMahon, April (Eds.), *The handbook of English linguistics*, 269–290. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Depraetere, Ilse & Verhulst, An. 2008. Source of modality: a reassessment. *English Language and Linguistics*, 1–25. Cambridge University Press.

Felici, Annarita. 2012. Shall Ambiguities in EU Legislative Texts. *Comparative Legilinguistics* 10, 51–66.

Font, Josep Maria. 1986. Modality and possibility in some intuitionistic modal Logics, *Notre Dame Formal Logic* 27, 533–546.

Gisborne, Nikolas. 2007. Dynamic modality. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 4, 44–61.

Givón, Thomas. 1993. *English Grammar: A Function-based Introduction. Volume I*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Greenbaum, Sidney. 1996. *The Oxford English Grammar*. Oxford Oxford University Press.

Grice, Herbert Paul. 1975. Logic and Conversation. In: Cole, Peter & Morgan, Jerry L. (Eds.), *Syntax and Semantics* 3, Speech Acts, 41–58. New York: Academic Press.

Halliday, M. A. K. 1994. *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

Halliday, M. A. K. & Matthiessen, C.M.I.M. 2014. *Halliday's Introduction to Functional Grammar* (4th ed.). Oxon: Routledge.

Hansen, Björn. 2005. How to measure areal convergence: a case study of contact-induced grammaticalization in the German-Hungarian-Slavonic contact area. In: Hansen, Björn & Karlík, Petr (eds.), *Modality in Slavonic Languages. New Perspectives*, 219–237. München: Sagner.

Hansen, Björn. 2007. A morpho-syntactic typology of constructions with modals in Serbian. In: Grković-Mejdžor, Jasmina & Ružić, Vladislava & Pavlović, Slobodan (eds.), *Sintaksička istraživanja: dijahrono- inhroni plan.* (Lingvističke sveske 6), 31–44. Novi Sad: Filozofski fakultet, Odsek za srpski jezik i lingvistiku.

Hermerén, Lars, 1978. *On modality in English: a study of the semantics of the modals*. Lund: Lund University Press.

Hoffman, Thomas R. 1993. *Realms of meaning*. New York. NY: Longman.

Horn, Laurence Robert. 1972. *On the Semantic Properties of Logical Operators in English*. PhD thesis. UCLA.

Hoye, Leo. 1997. *Adverbs and modality in English.* London; New York: Longman.

Huddleston, Rodney. 1976. *An introduction to English transformational syntax*. London: Longman

Huddleston, Rodney & K. Pullum, Geoffrey. 2002. *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Huddleston, Rodney & K. Pullum, Geoffrey. 2005. *A Student's Introduction to English Grammar.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Imre, Attila. 2010. Translating Modal Verbs with Translation Environment. Should and ought to, In: Research, Education, Development. inter national Symposium 2010 Tîrgu-Mureş, 447-454. Cluj-Napoca: Risoprint,.

Jelovšek, Tjaša. 2021. Translating Strong Obligation in Slovene and English Legal Texts: A Bidirectional Study. *Hieronymus* 8, 27–53.

Jonke, Ljudevit. 1964. *Književni jezik u teoriji i praksi* (2nd ed.) Zagreb: Znanje.

Joos, Martin. 1964. *The English Verb: Form and Meaning*. Madison and Milwaukee: The University of Wisconsin Press.

Kalogjera, Damir. 1982. *The English Modals and Their Equivalents in Serbo-Croatian. With Pedagogical Material by Mirjana Vilke*. Zagreb: University of Zagreb, Faculty of Philosophy, Institute of Linguistics.

Kačmárová, Alena. 2011, Modality: A Framework for Conveying Judgments. *SKASE Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 8 (1), 22–56.

Kiefer, Ferenc. 1987. On defining modality. *Folia Linguistica* 21 (1), 67–94.

Kimble, Joseph. 1992. The Many Misuses of Shall. *Scribes Journal of Legal Writing* 3, 61–78.

Knežević, Božana & Brdar, Irena. 2011. Modals and modality in translation: a case study based approach. *Jezikoslovlje* 12 (2), 23–49.

Krapivkina, Olga A. 2017. Semantics of the verb shall in legal discourse. *Jezikoslovlje* 18 (2), 305–317.

Lakoff, Robin. 1972. The pragmatics of modality. *Papers from the Regional Meeting of the Chicago Linguistic Society* 8, 229–246.

Leech, Geoffrey & Svartvik, Jan. 2002. *A Communicative Grammar of English* (3rd ed.). London: Routledge.

Leech, Geoffrey. 2004. *Meaning and the English verb.* Harlow: Pearson Education.

Leech, Geoffrey & Hundt, Marianne & Mair, Christian & Smith, Nicholas. 2009. *Change in Contemporary English. Cambridge*. Cambridge University Press.

Liping, Chen. 2017. Mood, Modality and Polarity Analysis of Winston S. Churchill's Speech on Hitler's Invasion of the U.S.S.R. *Advances in Social Sciences Research Journal* 4 (1), 195–202.

Lyons, John. 1977. *Semantics: Volume 2.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Matković, Alen. 2022. *Expressing Obligation in Translations of Legal Texts from English into Croatian*. Master's thesis. Filozofski fakultet Zagreb.

Myhill, John. 1996. The development of strong obligation system in American English. *American Speech* 71, 339–388.

Narrog, Heiko. 2005. On defining modality again. *Language Sciences* 27, 165–192.

Nazalević Čučević, Iva & Belaj, Branimir. 2018. Sintaktičko-semantički status egzistencijalnih glagola biti, imati i trebati. *Croatica* 42 (62), 179–204.

Newmark, Peter. 1982. A further note on communicative and semantic translation. *Babel* 28, 18–20.

Newmark, Peter. 1988. *A Textbook of Translation*. Shanghai: Shanghai Foreign Language Education Press.

Newmark, Peter. 1998. *More Paragraphs on Translation*. New Jersey University Press: Multilingual Maters.

Nurmi, Arja & Kivilehto, Marja. 2019. Identifying Obligation in Legal Finnish and Swedish through English Translations: A Corpus-Assisted Approach: A Corpus-Assisted Approach. *Fachsprache* 41 (3–4):142–58.

Orts, Maria Ángeles. 2015. Power and complexity in legal genres: Unveiling Insurance Policies and Arbitration Rules. *International Journal of Semiotics and Law* 28 (3), 485–505.

Palić, Ismail & Omerović, Mirela. 2022. Komunikacijska upotreba glagola morati u bosanskome jeziku. *FLUMINENSIA* 34 (2), 269–301.

Palmer, Frank Robert. 1965. *A Linguistic Study of the English Verb*. London: Longman

Palmer, Frank Robert. 1986. *Mood and Modality.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press

Palmer, Frank Robert. 1990. *Modality and the English Modals* (2nd ed.) London, New York: Longman Group UK Limited.

Palmer, F. R. 1995. Negation and the modals of possibility and necessity. In: Bybee, Joan L. & Fleischman, Suzanne (eds.), *Modality in grammar and discourse*, 453–71. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Palmer, Frank Robert. 2001. *Mood and Modality* (2nd ed.) Cambridge University Press.

Portner, Paul. 2009. *Modality.* Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Portner, Paul. 2018. *Mood.* Oxford University Press.

Rubinstein, Aynat. 2012. *Roots of modality*. PhD thesis. University of Massachusetts, Amherst. Amherst.

Quirk, Randolph & Greenbaum, Sidney & Leech, Geoffrey & Svartvik, Jan. 1985. *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. New York: Longman.

Saeed, John. 1997. *Semantics*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers Ltd.

Saeed, John. 2003. *Semantics* (2nd ed.). London: Blackwell.

Shlomper, Genady. 2005. *Modality in Hindi,* Munich: LINCOM Europa.

Sweetser, Eve. 1990. *From Etymology to Pragmatics: Metaphorical and Cultural Aspects of Semantic Structure*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Šarčević, Susan. 2000. *New approach to legal translation*. The Hague: Kluwer.

Traugott, C. Elizabeth & Dasher, Richard. 2002. *Regularity in semantic change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

van der Auwera, Johan & Plungian, Vladimir A. 1998. Modality's semantic map. *Linguistic Typology* 2 (1), 79–124.

Varga, Mirna. 2016. *Epistemic Modality in Academic Discourse in the Croatian and English Language*. PhD thesis. Filozofski fakultet Osijek

Verhulst, An. 2012. *A Corpus-based analysis of root necessity meanings expressed by 'should', 'ought to' and 'be supposed to' in late 20th century British English*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.

Verhulst, An & Depraetere, Ilse & Heyvaert, Liesbet. 2012. Source and strength of modality: an empirical study of root *should*, *ought to* and *be supposed to* in Present-day British English. *Leuven Working Papers in Linguistics* 1. Katholieke Universiteit Leuven.

Verstraete, Jean-Christophe. 2004. The problem of subjective modality in the Functional Grammar model. In: Mackenzie, J. Lachlan & Gómez-González, Maria de los Angeles (eds.) *A New Architecture for Functional Grammar* (Functional Grammar series 24), 243–274. Berlin: Mouton.

Verstraete, Jean-Christophe. 2005. Scalar quantity implicatures and the interpretation of modality: Problems in the deontic domain. *Journal of Pragmatics* 37 (9), 1401–1418.

von Fintel, Kai & Gillies, Anthony. 2007. An opinionated guide to epistemic modality. *Oxford Studies in Epistemology* 2, 32–62.

von Fintel, Kai & Iatridou, Sabine. 2008. How to say ought in foreign: The composition of weak necessity modals. In: Guéron, Jacqueline & Lecarme, Jacqueline & Springer, Dordrecht (eds.) *Time and modality*, 115–141.

von Wright, Georg Henrik. 1951. *An Essay in Modal Logic,* North-Holland, Amsterdam.

Werkmann Horvat, Ana. 2021. Layers *of modality: On Double Modal Constructions by the Example of Croatian*. Berlin: De Gruyter.

Werkmann Horvat, Ana. 2023. Modalnost u hrvatskom jeziku: Što trebamo i moramo znati o njoj? *Rasprave: Časopis Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje*, 49 (1).

Westney, Paul. 1995. *Modals and periphrastics in English*. Niemeyer: Tübingen.

Whitlock Howe, Helen. 1975. *The Use of Modals in Everyday English*. Master's thesis. Eastern Illinois University

Zandvoort, Reinard Willem. 1975. *A Handbook of English Grammar*. Tokyo: Maruzen.

Zhang, Jinghua. 2019. A Semantic Approach to English Modality. *Journal of Language Teaching and Research* 10 (4), 879–885.