'Ought' is one of modal auxiliaries that could be used in spoken and writing activities. In fact, 'ought' is rare to be used in both activities, even, only few grammar books explain about it in detail. In terms of formal properties, the use of 'ought' is always followed by to-infinitive. It is used to express the speaker’s attitudes like obligation and advice. The other uses of 'ought' found in grammar books are: The use of 'ought' to express an unfulfilled duty or a sensible action that was neglected, and its syntactic is 'ought' followed by 'to have' and 'past participle'. 'Ought' can also express the idea that the subject is not fulfilling his obligation or he is acting foolishly, and the syntactic of this expression is, 'ought' followed by 'to be' and 'ing-verb.' In this research, the researchers found four other forms and meanings of 'ought' that are not found in grammar books, but they found in corpus. After analyzing the data of 'ought' from British National Corpus, it can be seen the ‘uniqueness’ of ‘ought’ as modal auxiliary since it is different from other auxiliaries in use. The researchers analyzed form, or syntactic meaning and meaning or semantic of 'ought'. The four forms and meanings of 'ought' found in British National Corpus are: (1) 'ought' with bare infinitive means obligation/duty meaning of the subject, (2) 'ought' with conjunctive adverbs and to infinitive of which meanings are: possibility, certainty, supposition, obligation meanings, (3)'ought' with phrases of giving opinion means expression of subject’s opinion. (4) 'ought' with nouns/noun phrases/pronouns, and the semantic of this form expresses subject or speaker’s opinion. The four syntactic meanings and semantic of ‘ought’ as the findings of the research could enrich the use of ‘ought’ in English both spoken and written.
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1. **Introduction**

Auxiliary verbs is one topics that is taught in grammar, and most of our students know well auxiliaries such as ‘can’, ‘may’, ‘might’, ‘could’, ‘must’, ‘will’, ‘shall’, ‘ought’ and others. We often find their explanation in most of grammar books, but not ‘ought’. Some grammar books only explain that ‘ought’ is one of auxiliaries of which meaning is the same as 'should'; moreover, it is also explained that the use of ‘ought ‘ is always followed by ‘to infinitive’, for example: *You ought to go to campus* which means that the speaker gives advice to the subject *you* to go to campus. Not many explanations could be found about ‘ought’, nor are the examples of it. The researchers, on the other hand, found some examples
about ‘ought’ and its uniqueness in corpus. The data from corpus make us know better that forms and meanings of ‘ought’ are more than what we used to know in grammar books. For that reason, the researchers are interested in doing research about the variant use of ‘ought.’ There are many aspects that could be researched about auxiliaries, but in this research, the researchers want to achieve (1) what are the uniqueness of ‘ought’ as modal auxiliary and (2) how many forms and meanings possessed by ‘ought’ as modal auxiliary.

The objective of this research is to analyze the uniqueness of ‘ought’ from *British National Corpus* on a qualitative study. Firstly, we classified our data for the retrieval of potential ‘ought’ from *BYU-BNC Corpus*. We, then turned our attention to form and meaning factors. In the final section, we provided a result of our findings and discussed possible explanations.

Modal auxiliary ‘ought’ is a very conspicuous phenomenon of spoken and written language, and it has been frequently discussed in the literature. Most attention has been given to its meanings, but there have been few qualitative studies and little has been said about their different uses in British English.

There are many research about ‘ought’ one of them is conducted by F.K Lee (2000). She made a great exception in a quantitative empirical study based on elicitation test and spoken Australian English from the *Australian Corpus of English* and the *Hong Kong Corpus* (HKC), but she has little to say about the meanings of ‘ought’ in Australian and Hong Kong grammar. She does report some forms of ‘ought’ between the two varieties, showing more Australian than Hong Kong examples in both corpus.

Another researcher about ‘ought’ carried out by Stern (2004). He is a modern scholar who discussed the principle of ‘ought implies can’ that is certainly possible in certain form. He didn’t mention in detail other auxiliaries that could be implied with ‘ought’ except ‘can’.

The next research of ‘ought’ is Greenspan (2007). He carried out on how the meanings of ‘ought’ have a closed link between practical reasons and moral. Greenspan uses the term moral because he thinks ‘ought’ with the expression of advice and obligation is moral means; therefore, the subject could obey or disobey advice or obligation.

‘Ought’ is also researched by Schroeder (2011). He pointed out that there are distinctions between agential and non-agential in ‘ought’ meanings. He suggested five hallmark of agential or deliberative ‘ought’, (1) they matter directly for advice in the sense that knowing what someone ought to do is knowing what is advisable for them to do; (2) they close practical deliberation in the sense that knowing what one ought to do is settling the question of what to do; (3) they are closely related to the notion of accountability; (4) they, unlike other ought-statements, support the principle that ‘ought’ implies ‘can’ and (5) they are closely related to the notion of obligation. In contrast to Chrisman (2011), there is nothing important in the distinction between agential and non-agential ought-statements.

From the research above, we can see that the first research found out the comparison of elicitation test and spoken Australia English from the *Australian Corpus of English* and the *Hong Kong Corpus*, while the second research discusses the principle of ‘ought’ that can be implied by other auxiliaries including ‘can’. However, he did not tell us clearly what auxiliaries can be implied except ‘can’. The third research of ‘ought’ is about the use of moral term. Greenspan uses that term because he thinks ‘ought’ with the expression of advice and obligation is moral means. It doesn’t matter, whether the subject will obey or not. Another research of ‘ought’ was done by Schroeder (2011). He points out the distinctions between agential and non-agential in ‘ought’ meanings, but his research is in contrast to Chrisman (2011) who researched that there is no importance in the distinction between agential and non-agential ‘ought’ statement. The gaps among those researches with ours are: our research has taken the data from *British National Corpus* and it can be found four other
uses of ‘ought’ which we never find in grammar books; besides, we researched ‘ought’ on syntactic meaning and semantic point of view.

2. Theoretical Review

2.1. Syntax

In this research, the researchers use some theories. One of them is syntax. According to Chomsky in his book (*Syntactic Structures*: 1971) syntax is the study of the principles and processes by which sentences are constructed in particular languages. Syntactic investigation of a given language has as its goal, the construction of a grammar that can be viewed as a device of some sort for producing the sentences of the language underanalysis. From this theory, it can be seen that syntax could be used to analyze words, phrases and sentences. Since the research is about ‘ought’ as a word then we use the theory of syntax to analyze it from the point of word order. The word ‘syntactic’ and ‘form’ are interchangeable in this research. One of the examples is,

You ought to submit your assignment tomorrow.

The word order of ‘ought” in this example is followed by ‘to-infinitive’, or we know it as a form of ‘ought’ with ‘to infinitive.’

2.2. Semantics

Another theories used by the researchers is semantics. Yule (1996) says that semantics is a branch of linguistics dealing with the meaning of words, phrases and sentences. Semantics is different from pragmatics because semantics does not analyze the intended speaker meaning, or what words denote on a given occasion, but the objective, conventional meaning. In addition, semantics is concerned with the conceptual meaning and not the associative meaning. The conceptual meaning is what a word in fact denotes, as for example *Friday the 13th* is a day between Thursday the 12th and Saturday the 14th, and that is the conceptual meaning of the phrase *Friday the 13th*. Yet, for many people the idea of that day brings to mind thoughts of bad luck and misfortune, and it is called associative meaning. The word ‘semantic’ can be implied by the word ‘meaning.’

From the theory above, the researchers will apply Yule’s theory of semantics to analyze meaning of sentences use different word orders of ‘ought.’ For example:

You ought to have paid your school fee.

The use of ‘ought’ in the sentence above is, that the subject did not fulfill his obligation in the past.

2.3. Thomson & Martinet’s Grammar Theory

The other theories used by the researchers are grammar theories connected to ‘ought’. First, the writers use grammar theory from Thomson & Martinet (1986). They state that auxiliary verbs can be classified into three as we can see from the following chart below:
From the chart above, it is clear that Thomson & Martinet have classified auxiliary verbs into three parts, namely: principal auxiliaries, modal auxiliaries, and semi modals. As the researcher only research ‘ought’ which is comprised as modal auxiliaries, then the two other classifications will not be discussed. ‘Ought’ has differences in use among other modal auxiliaries such as ‘can’, ‘may’, ‘will’, ‘must’, ‘should’ and so on. Modal auxiliaries are always followed by ‘bare infinitive’, except ‘ought’.

(a) You should buy that book.
(b) You must buy that book.
(c) You can buy that book.
(d) You ought to buy that book.

From the above examples, it is clear that ‘ought’ is followed by ‘to infinitive’, and not ‘bare infinitive’ as the other modals. Thomson & Martinet (1986) also state that ‘ought’ can be used in differences use. One of them is, it expresses the subject’s obligations or duty, but here there is neither the speaker’s authority (as with ‘must’), nor an outside authority (as with ‘have to’). It is purely a matter for the subject’s own conscience and the speaker is only reminding the subject of his duty, or giving advice. It is usually said without much emphasis. We can see the examples below:

(e) You ought to (or should) finish your task before going out. ’I know I should.’
   You ought to obey your parents.’

Another use of ‘ought’ is, it can be used to express advice, for example:

(f) You ought to go to campus’ it is much less emphatic than ‘You must go to campus’

‘Ought’ is used to express an unfulfilled duty or a sensible action that was neglected. In the negative it expresses a wrong or foolish action in the past. The example is:

(g) I ought to have taken those books back to the library last week. Now they are overdue and I shall have to pay a fine.

The example above shows that ‘ought’ with the ‘perfect infinitive’ expresses unfulfilled duty or sensible action that was neglected. Another use of ‘ought’ according to Thomson & Martinet (1986) is to express the idea that the subject is not fulfilling his obligation or that he is acting foolishly, rashly etc. The example is:
(h) He ought to be studying for his exam. He shouldn’t be spending all his time on the beach.

The use of ‘ought’ ‘followed by the ‘continuous infinitive’ shows the inability of the subject to fulfill his obligation because of his foolish action. From the theory of Thomson & Martinet, it can be concluded that ‘ought’ has three meanings in use. There are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic meaning</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Semantic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ought to + infinitive</td>
<td>He ought to go there</td>
<td>Subject’s obligation (a piece of advice comes from the speaker)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ought + perfect infinitive</td>
<td>You ought to have bought him some books for his study.</td>
<td>It expresses an unfulfilled obligation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ought + continuous</td>
<td>He ought to be editing his writing, and he shouldn’t write the new one.</td>
<td>It expresses the idea that the subject is not fulfilling his obligation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.4. Hewings’ Grammar Theory

The second theory of ‘ought’ used by the researchers is from Hewings (1999). He states that ‘ought’ can be used to express giving advice or making a recommendation. For example:

(i) These copies are not too clear.
(j) You should/ought to recopy them.

The example above shows us that ‘ought’ can express giving advice, and it is the same as ‘should’, but Hewings (1999) states that we cannot use ‘ought’ to express giving advice if the subject is I; therefore, we use ‘should’ or ‘would’, as the example below:

(k) I should/would leave early tomorrow morning.

Another use of ‘ought’ is talking about a responsibility or duty, as we can see below:

(l) You should/ought to be warned of the danger of swimming off this beach.

Hewings (1999) also states that ‘ought’ can express probability which means that something is PROBABLY TRUE now or will probably be true in the future.

(m) Have you got any knives? ‘There should/ought to be some where in the kitchen drawer. (because that’s where we always keep it).

(n) I enjoyed her first novel, so the one should/ought to be good.

The next use of ‘ought’ based on Hewings (1999) is to show an obligation in the past. It often indicates some criticism or regret, as we can see from the example below:
(o) He should/ought to have had my permission before he wore my shirt. (I am annoyed).
(p) She should/ought to have taken an umbrella when it rained. (I am sorry, but she didn’t take an umbrella).

Those examples above show us that ‘ought’ with ‘to have’ + ‘past participle’ express an obligation in the past that was not fulfilled by the subjects, and it made the speaker annoyed. Hewings (1999) state that ‘ought’ with ‘to have’ + ‘past participle’ can express an expectation that something happened, has happened, or will happen:

(q) If the flight is not delayed, it should/ought to have arrived in Bali on time.
(r) This work should/ought to have finished by the end of the month.

From those examples above, we can see that ‘ought’ can be used in different forms with different meanings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic meanings</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Semantic meaning</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ought + to infinitive</td>
<td>‘You ought to read some references before writing your paper.’</td>
<td>Expresses giving advice from the speaker and not from the subjects’ conscience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ought + to infinitive</td>
<td>‘Life guard ought to warn surfers if the wave is too dangerous for them’</td>
<td>Expresses responsibility or duty of the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ought + to infinitive</td>
<td>‘He is famous for his cook, and today his cook ought to be delicious as usual.’</td>
<td>Expresses probability which means something is probably true or probably true in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ought + to have + past participle</td>
<td>‘You ought to have returned my books soon, as I needed them.’</td>
<td>Expresses a past obligation that was not fulfilled by the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ought + to have + past participle</td>
<td>‘If finish your assignment tomorrow, your teacher ought to have given you good score.’</td>
<td>Expresses an expectation that something happened, has happened, will happen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hewings also states that in some meanings (semantic), ‘ought’ has the same level as ‘should’ as we can see from those examples above. From the two theories of ‘ought’ belong to Thomson & Martinet (1998) and Hewings (1999), we see the similarities of both of them, either in syntactic meaning, or in semantic, as it is shown from the above charts.

2.5 Corpus

Corpus Linguistic (CL) is one of Applied Linguistic and Lexicography developments. Kennedy states (1996) Corpus is a body of written text or transcribed speech which can be served as a basis for linguistic analysis and description, while McEnery and Wilson (2002)
state that Corpus is any collection of more than one text can be called a corpus, (corpus being Latin for ‘body’, hence a corpus is any body of text).

Corpus as a large collection of texts, and it is a body of written or spoken material upon which a linguistic analysis is based. One of the popular corpora (the plural form of corpus) is British National Corpus (BNC). British National Corpus (BNC) consists of a sample collection representing the universe of contemporary British English. BNC is a balanced corpus in the sense that it attempts to capture the full range of varieties of language use. It is also a mixed corpus containing both written and spoken ones. The spoken texts are the transcriptions of naturally occurring speech. It is estimated that BNC corpus has 100 million words. Ninety percent of the BNC is made up of written texts, and no wonder that corpus can be a promising reference for us to find the data to be researched. The data is based on the British National Corpus form Oxford University. Corpus also can function as a teaching material so that the activity of learning process will develop better.

The researchers found out that corpus give us the use of ‘ought’ more than we have studied from grammar books. After analyzing 100 data from corpus, the researchers found the uniqueness of ‘ought’. It is called unique because as modal auxiliary ‘ought’ can ‘play’ freely than other modal auxiliaries which are used very strictly in sentences. The findings of ‘ought’ from corpus are:

1. ‘Ought’ with ‘bare infinitive’

(1) We’re hoping to get a minibus, I don’t think we ought take a bus because we were very badly treated when we did that, we...

(2) ...the interview ended shortly and our ELF said something about how he ought not say that sort of thing on the North Western TV station...

The data above show that ‘ought’ with ‘bare infinitive’ express the possibility of the subjects not to fulfill his/her duty /obligation because they have been annoyed or forbidden to do that.

2. ‘Ought’ with ‘conjunctive adverbs’

(1) ...case from this by saying that the questions which we had answered were irrelevant and ought, therefore, not to be considered as questions...(supposition).

(2) ...the children’s choice ought, therefore, to be respected... (obligation).

(3) ...of the company’s business are fully reflected in share price. Maximizing present

(4) ...the product market ought, therefore, to stimulate management efficiency... (certainty).

Those data shown above express the use of ‘ought’ followed by ‘conjunctive adverbs’ and ‘to infinitive’ with different meanings in semantic, as we can read above. We can see that ‘conjunctive adverbs’ never come directly after modal auxiliaries except ‘ought.’ For example:
You can, therefore, borrow my book. We usually say: Therefore, you can borrow my book.

3. ‘Ought’ followed by the expression of giving opinion and to infinitive

(1) ...position in which they were before the transaction was entered into. So an order ought not, in my opinion, to require a contravener to repay...

(2) ...a class recovery sought by the SIB under paragraphs 11 and 13 of the prayer, I ought, I think, to give an indication of what...

(3) ...and authority, the policies of the state as they are, not as they ought, in the opinion of a jury, to be those ways...

Those above data reveal us that ‘ought’ can be followed by some expressions of giving opinion that express the subjects’ belief or opinion. Again, this is the uniqueness of ‘ought’ as modal auxiliary, because we never use the phrase or expression of giving opinion directly after modal auxiliary. For example:

(4) She must, I think, write the recommendation for her daughter. We usually say:

(5) I think, she must write the recommendation for her daughter.

4. ‘Ought’ followed by ‘noun/noun phrase/pronoun’

(1) ...Dear oh dear, who’d wanna pick that? I think they ought a drop rest out of it. It’s too complicated, isn’t it? ...

(2) ...much aware about evacuation procedures anyway. Yeah, yeah, yeah. So I think, we ought to you know use that. But then you see, you’ve got places like behind the main stand...

(3) ...Oh yes. Yes. Absolutely. Yes. It in it includes It ought to the Qs fees. Certainly. It shouldn’t do really. Anyway...

From the above data, we can see that ‘ought’ followed directly by ‘noun/noun phrase/pronoun’ which it is not necessary for other modal auxiliaries such as ‘can’, ‘may’, ‘must’ except in interrogative. It has a semantic meaning as opinion of speaker or subject of the sentence.

4. Conclusions and suggestions

After analyzing the data, the researchers can conclude that most of grammar books classify ‘ought’ as modal auxiliaries, and it has 5 syntactic meanings and 5 semantic as follows:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syntactic meanings</th>
<th>Semantic</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><em>Ought</em> + <em>to infinitive</em></td>
<td>Expresses giving advice from the speaker and not from the subjects’ conscience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ought</em> + <em>to infinitive</em></td>
<td>Expresses responsibility or duty of the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ought</em> + <em>to infinitive</em></td>
<td>Expresses probability which means something is probably true or probably true in the future.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ought</em> + <em>to have</em> + <em>past participle</em></td>
<td>Expresses a past obligation that was not fulfilled by the subject.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Ought</em> + <em>to have</em> + <em>past participle</em></td>
<td>Expresses an expectation that something happened, has happened, will happen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The other four forms and meanings of ‘ought’ found in British National Corpus are:

a. The form of ‘ought’ with ‘bare infinitive’ which its meaning is obligation/duty of the subject.

b. The form of ‘ought’ with ‘conjunctive adverbs’ and ‘to infinitive’ has meaning: possibility, certainty, supposition, obligation.

c. The form of ‘ought’ with ‘phrases of giving opinion’ has meaning the expression of subject’s opinion.

d. The form of ‘ought’ with ‘noun/pronouns’ has meaning as opinion of speaker or subject.

**Suggestions**

a. English teachers may find the use of ‘ought’ not only from grammar books but also from other references. One of the best examples to find out data is corpus, both British and American, because it is a collection of text, and includes both written and spoken material upon which a linguistic analysis based. Corpus might become one of teaching materials in learning process.

b. ‘Ought’ could be taught in more various ways so that students understand the use and function of it widely.
c. The research of ‘ought’ can be analyzed also from American Corpus in order to find the other forms and meanings of it to be carried out in wider scope of research.
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