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ABSTRACT
This study attempts a contrastive analysis of modality between English and Kurdish. The problem of the study is attributed to the difficulties faced by Kurdish learners and students at the Translation and English Departments at the College of Languages at the University of Duhok regarding mastering English modality in general and modal auxiliary verbs in particular. Modality is the category of meaning which is employed to express necessities and possibilities. The main aims of this study are to describe both epistemic and deontic modality in the two languages under study in order to define similarities and differences between them with respect to modality. The findings of the study show that modals in English are mostly grammatical auxiliaries, whereas in Kurdish they are mostly lexical items, and a variety of lexical items are employed for the expression of one single English modal auxiliary. The study ends up with a number of conclusions and recommendations.
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1. INTRODUCTION
In this study, modality will be investigated in English in comparison to Kurdish. By Kurdish in this study, the Behdini dialect or the Northern Kurmanji variety is meant. This variety is mainly spoken in the Duhok governorate.

The problem of the study lies in the difficulties and challenges faced by Kurdish learners and students at the Translation and English Departments at the College of Languages at the University of Duhok regarding mastering English modality in general and modal auxiliary verbs in particular. Linguists and researchers have detected that both primary and modal auxiliary verbs are the source of difficulty for the majority of EFL learners with different language backgrounds (Celece- Murcia and Larson-Freeman 1999; Chandra Bose 2005). Behdini Kurdish learners’ main challenges in mastering the modal verbs are related to the meanings and uses of the modals. Difficulties can be ascribed to the fact that Kurdish, unlike English, lacks modal verbs both in form and function (Bomba, 2001: 78-88; Ahmed, 2005: 6). Moreover, the English modals have a large variety of meanings; each modal might have more than one meaning and each meaning belongs to an interrelated system which can lead to confusion and ambiguity of use by English learners.

The study aims at presenting modality in English and in Kurdish and then to compare the results in a comparative way showing similarities and differences between the two languages. The main purpose of this study is to alleviate the difficulties faced by Kurdish students when translating modal auxiliaries from English to Kurdish. This piece of research also aims at finding solutions to the problems referred to above.

The value of this study lies in the hope that syllabus designers, teachers, and Kurdish EFL learners, translators, and students will make benefit of the findings of this study. This study will be of a significant value for the students at the Department of Translation as it tackles one of the fundamental topics in Contrastive Grammar.

2. MODALITY AND MODAL AUXILIARIES
One of the considerable grammatical categories in English is made by modal auxiliary verbs. A wide range of research has been conducted on modal verbs; among them Halliday (1970), Quirk and Greenbaum (1973), Lyons (1977), Leech (1987), Kreidler (1999), and several others. Many of these studies have tried to investigate modality showing the different uses of modal verbs and the type of modality that each modal verb expresses, i.e.,
whether it is epistemic or deontic modality (for example, Leyons, 1977 and Kreidler, 1999). It is to be noted that epistemic modality makes a reference to “the possibility, probability or impossibility of a particular proposition,” whereas deontic modality expresses “the necessity of an individual to act or not act in a particular way” (Kreidler, 1999: 241). Other studies have attempted a detailed account of the uses of each modal verb in contextualized situations; Leech’s thought (1987) is probably the most one of such treatments.

Modals in the field of linguistics are connected to the notions of possibility and necessity. Also, modal verbs possess a lot of different interpretations which not only rely on the particular modal being used but also on a number of factors including the position of the modals in the sentence, the meaning of the sentence which is independent of the modal, the context of conversation, and many others. For instance, an English sentence that contains the modal must might be interpreted as a sentence of knowledge or inference (roughly/ epistemic) or how something ought to be (roughly/ deontic). Consider examples (1) and (2) which explain the interpretive difference.

1. The lights in Jason’s home are off, he must be at bed.
2. The lights in Jason’s home are off, he must be away.

In (1), must is interpreted as indicating a statement of reasoned conclusion because the speaker comes to the conclusion that Jason is at bed because otherwise the lights in his house would have been on. In (2), on the other hand, must takes the shape of an interpretation of how something ought to be; the speaker thinks that since the lights in Jason’s home are off, Jason ought to be outside his home.

There is a contradiction in the use of the modal, especially in cases like example (1) with not using a modal, for example:

3. Jason must be at bed.
4. Jason is at bed.

In (3) to reach the conclusion that Jason is at bed is followed by a process of reasoning that was employed. However, if the speaker would know for sure that Jason is at bed, which means that this is taken as a fact as is the case in example (4), then there is no need for example (3).

There are various ways to express modalities in various languages. In English, for instance, apart from modal auxiliary verbs, modality can also be expressed by modal adjectives such as probable and possible, modal adverbs such as probably and possibly, and by modal nouns such as probability and possibility.

Behdini Kurdish, unlike English, does not have a distinct class of modal verbs with clear-cut distinctions (Bomba, 2001: 78- 88). In Kurdish, modal meanings are realized by various means with syntactic structures including particles (شتێت), phrases (نێوەیەکان), and lexical verbs (نێوەیەکان), and by modal nouns such as ضروریت کردەم, (شێتانەیی) and lexical verbs (نێوەیەکان), and by modal nouns such as ضروریت کردەم, (شێتانەیی)

English examples (5- 7) below together with their Kurdish translations illustrate the points raised above. It is to be noted that the examples are researchers’ own.

5. Azad can type very quickly.
6. I should sleep early tonight.
7. The phone may be on the table.

All the three English sentences (5, 6, and 7) above contain modal auxiliary verbs, which are can, should, and may respectively. Because Kurdish lacks modal auxiliary verbs, however, the English modal meanings expressed by modal verbs are realized through other ways including the verb (نێوەیەکان ... شێتانەیی) as a translation for can, the particle (نێوەیەکان) as a translation for should, and particles (نێوەیەکان ... شێتانەیی) as translations for may.

Based on the comparison above, it is clear that English has a grammaticalized modality, whereas Kurdish does not seem to have a grammaticalized modality. Therefore, a variety of lexical items are employed in Kurdish to express the meaning of a single English modal auxiliary verb. However, it is not to be assumed that the two paraphrases of (a) and (b) under (5), the two paraphrases of (a) and (b) under (6), and the three paraphrases of (a), (b), and (c) under (7) are exact synonyms.
3. CLASSIFICATION OF MODALS

In general, according to Steel et al., (1981) modality is expressed to denote any of the semantic meanings listed below:

a) “Possibility” and the connected notion of “Permission,”
b) “Probability” and the connected notion of “Obligation,”

c) “Certainty” and the connected notion of “ Requirement.”

Linguists have tackled the topic of modals in English in two different ways: formally and logically. Quirk, et al (1974: 219) have defined modality as “the manner in which the meaning of a clause is qualified.” For Bell (1991: 193), the system of modality is “an extremely important one, since it gives the communicator the options of expressing an opinion about the extent to which the assertion is possible, probable, certain or frequent”. Bell (1991: 139-140) draws a distinction between modality and modulation. According to him, modality is related to propositions, but modulation is connected to proposals. Moreover, modality involves probability, possibility, certainty and frequency, whereas modulation comprises obligation and inclination.

Modality is viewed as part of the impersonal constituents of language for Halliday (1970). Halliday also classifies modal auxiliary verbs in English in terms of modality and modulation (which is the ideational constituent of language). As for Lyons, he (1977) classifies modals into epistemic and deontic. Generative grammarians, on the other hand, usually deal with modals as root and epistemic modals (Hacquard & Cournane, 2016). Lyons attributed characteristics to epistemic modals to make them concerned with matters of knowledge, belief, or opinion rather than facts, but he attributes necessity or possibility of acts performed by morally reasonable agents to deontic modality. Lyons (1977: 797) exemplifies a modal or modalized utterance as in (8) and (9).

8. Alfred may be unmarried.
9. Alfred must be unmarried.

Lyons is probably the first one to distinguish between two kinds of epistemic modality: subjective and objective (1977: 799). In his description of subjective epistemic modality, Lyons proposes the opinion of the speaker or his/her tentative inference. And the essence is to “express the speaker’s reservations about giving an unqualified or categorical ‘I-say-so’ to the factuality of the proposition embedded in the utterance.” On the other hand, objective epistemic modality does not reveal the expression of reservations as shown in the subjective. Rather, the speaker in an objective epistemically modalized utterance is committed to the factuality of what he says in the proposition; he only performs the act of telling and nothing else.

4. MODALITY IN ENGLISH AND KURDISH

Modality is a muddy notion that revolves around the senses of permission, possibility, and necessity. Therefore, apart from why a modal expression is used, the proposition content of the sentence is expressed by a modal sentence concerning some contextual limitations (Werner, 2006: 235). The two kinds of modality proposed by Lyons (epistemic and deontic) are approved and recognized to a wide range as the two semantically principal types of modality (van der Auwerda & Plungian 1998).

4.1 Epistemic modality

Several modals possess functions that overlap between deontic and epistemic meanings. The basic past and non-past epistemic modals include must, may, might, will, would, can’t, couldn’t, should, ought to, needn’t, and daren’t.

Epistemic modality is connected to truth or reality relations by pointing out to a speaker’s commitment to the truth of a proposition. Actually, these modal auxiliaries give the ability to the speaker to express ‘certainty’, ‘deduction’, ‘probability’, and ‘possibility’ (Berk, 1999: 133).

Epistemic modality also refers to a judgement a speaker makes about a proposition, which indicates the necessity and possibility of the being or truthfulness of the proposition (Quirk et al 1985: 223). The proposition is seen as uncertain or probable relative to the speaker’s knowledge. Therefore, the discussion below is going to be about uncertainty, which is epistemic possibility. The English modal auxiliaries that can be used epistemically are may/might and can/could as illustrated below.

4.1.1 May / Might

In English may is used to express doubts by the speaker as to the reality or truth of the proposition (Coates 1983: 133). The Kurdish
translations are provided for comparative purposes.

10. a. You may be right.
   دبیت (چێدبیت) نە نەی برای بەرەم بەی.
   b. He may go to London every day.
   رەنگە (چێدبیت) نەوەوە نەوەیزەیە بەرەم بەی/ەندە.

As shown in (10), ‘possible that’ sounds to be an accurate paraphrasing. *May*, on the other hand, in this context has a stressful sense and it holds a fall-rise nuclear tone (Quirk et al 1985: 223).

As for *might*, it is clear that it stands for the past form of *may*, yet its behavior is different from that of the past form in the normal sense. It can take a tentatively alternative form of *may* with a present time reference and it expresses little less certainty about the possibility (Palmer 1990). Based on the examples in (11), it can be inferred that there is little ambiguity when it comes to *might*. Palmer (1990: 184) argues that the most likely interpretations for the two examples are either “it is tentatively possible that it is not very important” or “it is possible that it would be nice.”

11. a. Of course I might be wrong.
   بەژیت بۆ ماوەیەکێ.
   b. So he might go and live with his parents for a while.
   چێدبیت دگەل دەیکوبابێن خۆ بیت.

The difference between *may* and *might* in accordance with Quirk et al (1985: 233) seems to be neutralized when they are used for expressing a speculative or unsettled (tentative) possibility or meaning. Let us consider the examples in (12) below.

12. a. You may be wrong.
   دبیت (چێدبیت) تو بێ شاش بی.
   b. You might be wrong.
   رەنگە (چێدبیت) تو بێ شاش بی.

(a) and (b) under (16) are considered identical for many speakers.

Also, epistemic modality is rarely interrogated. And if it is interrogated, the form that is used in negation is also used in interrogation. Most often, *can* is used instead of *may* for questions as in (13).

13. Can they be on holiday?
   نەرێ پێ تەو بێت نەوە د پەینەکەیان د بی?

However, sometimes *may* is also used in questions as in 14.

14. May we be doing him an injustice?
   نەرێ تەو بێت نەوە نەوە دەگەڵ وی نەخەنم؟
   (a) دەدەن؟
   (b) تەو چێدبیت نەوە نەوە لە دکەین نەوەدەرەوەرەبی؟

4.1.2 Can / Could

Palmer states that *can* and *could* impose a problematic and controversial status in epistemic modality (1990: 51). For Coates (1983: 19), *can* is never epistemic in its positive form. As for Goossens (1979: 31), *can* only expresses epistemic modality in non-assertive constructions. Also, *can* replaces *may* in negation and questioning modality. *Could*, on the other hand, is the tentative form in non-assertion and it replaces *might*. It is to be noted that *can* and *could* are not the dominating modals when functioning in the epistemic possibility.

15. a. Can they be serious?
   نەرێ دبیت نەوە د رژد بی?
   b. What can they be doing?
   نەرێ نەوەی بەچک؟
   c. Where can she have put it?
   نەرێ نەوەی نەفتی داوانەکی کەری؟

As shown in (15), we can use *can* epistemically in questions when we want to express doubt, surprise, or confusion (OALD 1995: 161).

In Kurdish, a lot of expressions are available to convey the same meaning as the one expressed by *may/might* and *can/could* in English. For example, the sentence in (16) below can be translated in four different ways expressing the same meaning.

16. The dean may be at his office.
   (a) دبیت رەنگە (چێدبیت) نەوەوەی زۆر دەبێت لە ماوەی خۆبیت.
   (b) رەنگە (چێدبیت) نەوەوەی زۆر دەبێت.
   (c) دیشەم دیاوە کە رەنگە (چێدبیت) نەوەوەی زۆر دەبێت.
   (d) چێدبیت رەنگە (چێدبیت) نەوەوەی زۆر دەبێت.

One point of similarity can be detected between the grammatical structure of the English and the equivalent Kurdish expressions. This is because, just like English, all the Kurdish translations of the sentence “The dean may be at his office” involve an epistemic modal marker which is preceded by a proposition. On the other hand, the main difference between the two languages is that the Kurdish translations (a), (b), (c), and (d) under (16) are not grammaticalized modal auxiliary verbs like English, but they range between a variety of lexical items that are used to express the modal meaning.

Kurdish grammarians do not actually recognize modality as a grammatical category nevertheless dispersed references they make to the semantic meaning of modal particles and phrases like *دەنەوناوی* (د شیان دایە), (رەنگە) (دەبیت), etc. (Subir, 2008).
The Kurdish two forms of (ترەمەکە) and (دەستوێر) are probably the closest equivalents of *may* in English. Their use is usually susceptible to certain syntactic restrictions as shown below:

a. (ترەمەکە), (دەستوێر) normally precede a verbal sentence and they either follow the subject as in (17a) or follow the subject as in (17b).

17. a. دەستوێر / جەنگە: نازەرد لە مەل بوور. (Azad may have been at home.)
   b. (ترەمەکە) / (دەستوێر) can be followed by a nominal (non-verbal) sentence introduced by the Ezafe particle (بێئ) as in (18).

   18. (Azad may be at home.)

As for the past tense of the epistemic necessity, commands, permission, and undertaking, the modal auxiliaries of (تەکۆمزیت) and (دەستوێر) are probably the closest equivalents of *must* in English. Their use is usually susceptible to certain syntactic restrictions as shown below:

a. (ترەمەکە) / (دەستوێر) - The modal auxiliaries of (ترەمەکە) and (دەستوێر) can be followed by a nominal (non-verbal) sentence introduced by the Ezafe particle (بێئ) as in (19).

   19. (Our team may win tonight.)

Let us consider example (20).

20. The dean must be at his office.

   بێگۆمان راگر لە ئۆفیسەی بێت.

   This use of epistemic *must* is used by Palmer (2001) as: the only possible conclusion is that the dean is at his office. And the Kurdish corresponding phrase can be as follows:

   (a) راگر یێ ل نەپێسەکەرە خۆ خۆ (ترەمەکە) / بێگۆمان راگر لە ئۆفیسەی بێت.
   (b) راگر یێ ل نەپێسەکەرە خۆ خۆ (دەستوێر) / بێگۆمان راگر لە ئۆفیسەی بێت.
   (c) یاو راگر یێ ل نەپێسەکەرە خۆ (ترەمەکە) / بێگۆمان راگر لە ئۆفیسەی بێت.
   (d) یاو راگر یێ ل نەپێسەکەرە خۆ (دەستوێر) / بێگۆمان راگر لە ئۆفیسەی بێت.

The speaker suggests under the basis of this modalized expression that there is evidence for the availability that concludes that the dean is at his office. This modality carries a force that approaches that of certainty but it is not fully equivalent to certainty. This is because it allows for a tiny marginal chance of doubt which is shared both by English *must* and Kurdish (ترەمەکە) / (دەستوێر).

As for the past tense of the epistemic meaning of *must*, for sure we cannot derive the past tense from the form of *must* itself but in order to refer to an inference and a conclusion that has to do with the past time status, the expression of *must + have + past participle* tends to be used. And in Kurdish this is translated as (ترەمەکە / بێگۆمان) / (پێ نەپێسەکەرە) خۆ خۆ (ترەمەکە) / بێگۆمان / (بێئ) خۆ خۆ (دەستوێر).

As in (21), the dean must have been at his office.

21. (ترەمەکە / بێگۆمان) / (پێ نەپێسەکەرە) خۆ خۆ (ترەمەکە) / بێگۆمان / (بێئ) خۆ خۆ (دەستوێر)

2.2 Undertaking

According to Querk et al, the deontic modal auxiliary that is used for undertaking in English is *shall*, which is limited to second and third person subjects in assertion (1985: 815). Consider the following examples and the explanation followed for the meaning expressed by *shall*.

24. You shall do exactly as I say.

   تۆ دەتوان دەگەیە یە، ئەمە نەوە بەوە. یە.

   In (24), *shall* does not only express an obligation but it also provides a guarantee or an undertaking that the action will occur. *Shall* here is thought to be stronger than *must* (Palmer 1990: 74).

25. She shall get her money as soon as she has earned it.

   نەو دەتوان دەگەیە خۆ خۆ وەرگریت نیژکەر پیشی بەستمەشی. یە.

   In (25), *shall* is described by Querk et al as a modal that is used in granting a favor.

26. You shall suffer for this.

   دەسەر خاتە یە خۆجە، تەوەش نازەر بۆه.

   In (26), on the other hand, *shall* expresses a threat.

4.2 Deontic modality

According to Lyons (1977, 792), deontic modals are related to the possibility and necessity of those acts that are performed by agents. We use them for expressing the meanings of wants, obligation, desires, necessity, commands, permission, and undertaking. The modal auxiliary verbs involved are *should/ought to, daren’t, needn’t*, and *shall* for undertaking; and *must, may, and can* for permission.
27. The 1947 act shall have effect as if this section were included in part III thereof.

In Kurdish, on the other hand, (دەفێت) and (دەفێت) are used without any variety in the obligation degree of strength as equivalents to must, should, and ought to as seen in the last three examples.

5. CONCLUSIONS

This study has reached a number of conclusions. The findings below are put forward comparatively between English and Kurdish:

1. There are two main types of modality: Epistemic and Deontic, which are approved and recognized to a wide range as the two major semantically fundamental types of modality. However, the majority of the modals share both epistemic and deontic senses, and they only differ in the strength they show.

2. In English, among the means expressing modality the main ones are grammatical auxiliaries such as can, could, shall, should, will, may, might, etc., whereas in Kurdish they are mostly lexical items; a variety of lexical items are employed for the expression of one single modal auxiliary in English. For example, in Kurdish, modal meanings are realized by various means with syntactic structures including particles (دەفێت), (دەفێت), (دەفێت), (دەفێت), and lexical verbs (دەفێت).

3. The English modal auxiliaries that are used to express epistemic meanings are may/might, can/could, and must to show the senses of ‘deduction’, ‘probability’, ‘possibility’, and ‘certainty’ respectively. The Kurdish lexical items used as equivalents to may/might and can/could include (دەفێت), (دەفێت), and (دەفێت), whereas the items used as equivalents to must include (دەفێت), (دەفێت), (دەفێت), (دەفێت), and (دەفێت).

4. As for deontic modality, in English may and can are used to denote permission, shall is used to denote undertaking, and must, should, and ought to are used to denote obligation or necessity. The Kurdish equivalents for may and can are (دەفێت), and (دەفێت), for shall the equivalent is (دەفێت), and for must, should, and ought to are (دەفێت) and (دەفێت).

5. There is an overlap in meaning and function in the majority of the English modals, for example must can show both obligation and certainty and can show both ability and permission and so forth. In Kurdish, on the other hand, this overlap in meaning is almost only shown with (دەفێت), which can show ability and permission.
6. In English, there is a semantic complexity of modals and a multiplicity of meanings which are expressed by one single modal, but this is not the case in Kurdish.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Due to the differences between the English and Kurdish modality systems, Kurdish learners of English will definitely face challenges and difficulties in acquiring, mastering, and translating English modal auxiliaries; based on those difficulties, the following recommendations are made:

1. Holding a study on the acquisition of modal auxiliary verbs by Behdini-Kurdish learners of English.
2. Holding a study on the translation competence of English modal auxiliary verbs by Behdini-Kurdish translation students.
3. Teachers and textbook designers have to raise the level of the consciousness of students to the importance of modals in everyday communication.
4. The negative consequences of misusing modals must be shown to students by teachers and textbook designers.
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پوخته

ویشته فاکولینی هاول ددەت شێوە فاکولینی چاکار بە فەربەر لسەرمە تەچەمکن چاواتی نینگلیزی و کوردی دەسەردەت دەکات. بئریشا فاکولینی دەهەوێ دەیەن دەوە دەردەی کە فەڕەکەوە و فەڕەبیائیی کورد لە هەردوو باشتر وەرگرێنی و زمانەی نینگلیزی لە کۆنترا لەکۆنیان لە لەکۆنی دەھێنی بەرەنگارەیی زەمەمایە و ناسەکان دەیەیە کە درەوارەی فیزیونی کاونیی دەستبازیان نینگلیزی دا بەگشتی و کاری نەکاردەوەنی چاواتی بەیەبەیی. جاوازی بەرکە ژیاوەر، راکەیەیین کە دەهەوێت بکارەیە بۆ ورە بەرەوە و رێکەوەیەکان. نامبانگەیان سەرمەکی بینەوە فاکولینی دەیەت (deontic modality) و یا یدەکەیین (epistemic modality) وەسفەکاری و جۆری چاواتی کە دەبەت بکەیەن بەرەوە و بەرەوە پێیە، کە خۆیەوە و دەبەتەنەکە خەڵکی و فەرەکەیە و جەوازیان دەیەوە نینگلیزی کە هەردوو زمانەی دەستبازیوکەیەن. کە دەبەت بکەیەن بەرەوە و بەرەوە و دەبەتەنەکە خەڵکی و فەرەکەیە و جەوازیان دەیەوە نینگلیزی کە هەردوو زمانەی دەستبازیوکەیەن. کە دەبەت بکەیەن بەرەوە و بەرەوە و دەبەتەنەکە خەڵکی و فەرەکەیە و جەوازیان دەیەوە نینگلیزی کە هەردوو زمانەی دەستبازیوکەیەن. کە دەبەت بکەیەن بەرەوە و بەرەوە و دەبەتەنەکە خەڵکی و فەرەکەیە و جەوازیان دەیەوە نینگلیزی. فەکولینی دەرئەنجام و راسپارەن ب دەوەیەک دەهەنی. 

الخلاصة

تحاول هذه الدراسة إجراء تحليل مقارن للموقفية (Modality) في اللغتين الإنجليزية والكردية. تكمن مشكلة الدراسة في الصعوبة التي يواجهها المتعلمين والطلاب الكرد في قسم الترجمة واللغة الإنجليزية في كلية اللغات في جامعة دهوک فيما يتعلق بptaقة الموقفية في اللغة الإنجليزية بشكل عام والأخلاق المساندة الموقفية بشكل خاص. الموقفية هي فئة المعنى المستخدمة للتعبير عن الضرورات والإمكانات، بالاضافة الى الامكانيات، والأهداف الرئيسيه لهذه الدراسة هي وصف كل من الموقفية المعرفية والأدبية في اللغتين في اجل تحديد أوجه التشابه والاختلاف بينهما فيما يتعلق بالموقفية. وتظهر نتائج الدراسة أن الوسائل الموقفية الرئيسية في اللغة الإنجليزية هي أفعال مساعدات نحوية، بينما في اللغة الكردية هي من القالب عناصر معجمية، وبالتالي يتم استخدام مجموعة متنوعة من العناصر المعجمية للتعبير عن فعل مساعد إنجليزي واحد. وتختتم الدراسة بعدد من الاستنتاجات والتوصيات.