

**EXPRESSING MODALITY
IN ENGLISH
AND KYRGYZ LANGUAGES**

This article presents expressing of modal verbs in the Kyrgyz and English languages. The present contribution is concerned with an area of grammar – that of modal verbs – which has shown and still shows a degree of variation across different forms of the English language. Rendering and expressing English modal verbs into Kyrgyz language is very important and disputable question till present days. In this paper we would like to examine some of the problems that have to be coped with if one tries to set up a contrastive modality of English and Kyrgyz in the frame of semantics and pragmatics, with special emphasis on their occurrence with performative verbs. We will therefore mainly be concerned with comparing modal auxiliaries of English and Kyrgyz. We will focus on how the modal auxiliaries are used and what kind of rules are involved in their usage and the use of modal auxiliaries is important, i.e. their function in a sentence. We would like to point out certain undesirable consequences of the syntactic approach and

to offer some suggestions in the light of performative analysis. Two kinds of modalities are epistemic, i.e. those that signal the degree of commitment the speaker has to the truth of the proposition. Various ways have been proposed to classify predicates in English.

Modality is to be understood as a semantic category. By means of modal expressions the speaker can evaluate a particular situation in terms of possibility, probability, permission, volition, obligation and necessity. Modal auxiliary verbs give more information about the function of the main verb that follows it. Although having a great variety of communicative functions, these functions can all be related to a scale ranging from possibility («may») to necessity («must»). Within this scale there are two functional divisions:

Epistemic, concerned with the theoretical possibility of propositions being true or not true (including likelihood, and certainty); *Deontic*, concerned with possibility and necessity in terms of freedom to act (including ability, permission, and duty).

The following sentences illustrate the two uses of *must*:

- epistemic: You **must** be starving. (e.g., «It is necessarily the case that you are starving.»)

- deontic: You **must** leave now. (e.g., «You are required to leave now.»)

- ambiguous: You **must** speak Spanish.

- epistemic: «It is surely the case that you speak Spanish (after having lived in Spain for ten years).»

- deontic: «It is a requirement that you speak Spanish (if you want to get a job in Spain).»

Epistemic modals can be analyzed as raising verbs while deontic modals can be analyzed as control verbs.

Modals include modal verbs, semi-modal verbs (also called marginal modals) and other modal expressions. They combine with main verbs and modify their meanings. A modal may have several different meanings, while similar meanings may be expressed by using different modals. The following table sums up the nine central modals and other semi-modals and their meanings:

Epistemic meaning	Deontic meaning	Central modals	Semi-modals
Possibility	Permission	<i>Can, could, may, might</i>	
Necessity	Obligation	<i>Must, should</i>	<i>(Had) better, have (got) to, need to, ought to, be supposed to</i>
Prediction	Volition	<i>Will, would, shall</i>	<i>Be going to</i>

Modal verbs always come first in a verb phrase and are followed by a bare infinitive. When used with a perfect infinitive, modal verbs usually refer to past time:

I could hear the dog barking outside. (modal + simple bare infinitive)

You must be joking. (modal + continuous bare infinitive)

He may have caught the train. (modal + perfect bare infinitive)

You must have been waiting for hours. (modal + perfect continuous bare infinitive)

Contracted forms of will and would are often used in spoken and in informal written language ("ll and "d):

I'd tell you if I knew.

They'll be here soon.

Modal verbs take no -s in the third person singular: *He might be at the office.*

Modal verbs form their negative and interrogative like other auxiliaries and not with do:

I can't swim.

Can you swim?

The following contracted negative forms are often used in spoken and in informal written language:

<i>cannot</i>	<i>can't</i>
<i>might not</i>	<i>mightn't</i>
<i>will not</i>	<i>won't</i>
<i>shall not</i>	<i>shan't</i>
<i>would not</i>	<i>wouldn't</i>
<i>should not</i>	<i>shouldn't</i>
<i>must not</i>	<i>mustn't</i>

Modal verbs have no infinitive, -ing or past participle forms and cannot be followed by other modal verbs. When necessary, modal idioms or other expressions are used instead of them:

~~*If you want to be a sailor, you must can swim.*~~
~~*If you want to be a sailor, you must be able to swim.*~~

~~*I have canned swim since the age of five.*~~
~~*I have been able to swim since the age of five.*~~

Semi-modal verbs

The semi-modal verbs (or marginal modals) are: dare, need, used to and ought to. They behave similarly to modal verbs but also share some characteristics with main verbs:

How dare she criticize us? (as a modal verb, the interrogative formed without do)

He didn't dare to look back. (as a main verb, followed by a to-infinitive and the negative formed with do)

Need you make so much noise? (as a modal verb, the interrogative formed without do)

You needn't have been so rude. (as a modal verb, the perfect infinitive used to refer to past time)

Do you need to use the hairdryer? (as a main verb, followed by a to-infinitive and the interrogative formed with do)

They used to live by the sea. (Unlike a modal verb, followed by a to-infinitive)

You ought to know that by now. (Unlike a modal verb, followed by a to-infinitive)

Other modal expressions

Besides modal verbs and semi-modal verbs, there are other expressions which can express modal meanings. Some of these are formed with be:

<i>be able to</i>	<i>be going to</i>
<i>be allowed to</i>	<i>be likely to</i>
<i>be about to</i>	<i>be obliged to</i>
<i>be bound to</i>	<i>be supposed to</i>

Other expressions that carry modal meanings are: be to, had better, have (got) to, would rather.

Adverbs are often used with modals to add to their meaning:

Surely you can't have said that to her!

I might just tell you all about it.

I could easily have been hurt.

You really shouldn't have gone to so much trouble.

I will definitely call you tomorrow.

Kyrgyz Modal verbs

Various ways have been proposed to classify predicates in English. In English there are a number of modal auxiliaries: *ought to, used to, need, dare, had better, must, should, will, would*. Each modal auxiliary is used in different contexts and it has also different functions. The situation is entirely different in Kyrgyz. Although modality exists in Kyrgyz, it is not as clearly marked as it is in English. Since there are no modal auxiliaries in Kyrgyz like the ones in English, modality is usually marked on the main verb. Modalities in most cases are conveyed covertly in sentences in Kyrgyz. They are not used with performative verbs in Kyrgyz. Semantically, *requests, necessity, condition* and *imperatives* are the main modal performatives in Kyrgyz. Modality acts like an aspect of the verb in a sentence. It is the realization of the act that the verb of the sentence undertakes. Modality indicates the situation of the act. Modality and tense are different entities in Kyrgyz. It is possible to find modality in any tense, but not the other way around. Some models modals have got tense. Due to the syntactic structure of Kyrgyz we can not show a class of modals as we can in English, but it is possible to compare modality between languages as far as the use of language is concerned. Kyrgyz uses verbal suffixes and auxiliary to convey certain modal meanings with respect to the speaker's attitude. I will explain and exemplify the English modals and give examples of their Kyrgyz counterparts. In terms of their functions, modals in Kyrgyz can be classified as follows:

• **Possibility** (*мүмкүн, балким, болжолу, кыязы, өңдөңөт, сыягы, сыяктуу, чагында, шекилдүү*).

These modal words express the probability, uncertainty, unreality to the meaning of the sentences.

1. *Кош болуңуз, балким дагы көрүшөбүз.* (А. Токомбаев)

Here modal (*балким*) shows the possibility or probability of future meeting.

2. *Кыязы, менден мурун да бир топ сөз болуп өтсө керек.*

Modal verb (*кыязы*) shows the uncertainty of the happened situation. The speaker is not sure was it spoken or not.

3. *Мүмкүн, тиги бок жүрөк ошенткендир!* (Т. Абдумомунов)

Modal verb (*мүмкүн*) expresses the suspicion of the situation.

4. *Балким, бүгүн кечке келип калар, баланын көкүрөк өйүгөн ойун түшүнгөндөй, жубата сүйлөдү Жумай.* (М. Макенбаев).

Modal verb (*балким*) adds the possibility and probability to meaning of the sentence.

• **Reality modal verbs adds certainty, to the meaning and always supports the meaning.**

(*акыйкатта, албетте, арийне, дурус, созсуз, чындыгында, чынында, шексиз*)

1. *Арийне, Доо –аке бул санаасын ачык айтса, ага Эр-киши көнмөк эмес.* (Т. Сыдыкбеков)

Modal verb (*ырас*) expresses the speakers certain opinion.

2. *Ырас, Жапардын жүрөгүндө белгисиз сыр бар, же оор кайгы бар.* (А. Токомбаев).

Speaker expresses the certainty of his opinion using the modal verb (*ырас*).

3. *Бул кызмат эн жогорку кызмат, албетте.* (К. Баялинов)

The speaker expresses the reality of the situation.

4. *Албетте, бул чындык, нукура чындык.* (К. Жантошев)

Modal verb (*албетте*) adds certainty to the meaning

• **Modal verbs (керек, тийиш) expresses the necessity.**

1. *Сенин отурган жеринди кетмендеп, салуу керек.* (Ж. Боконбаев)

Modal verb (*керек*) expresses the strong necessity.

2. *Акыркы замандын жаштары көпту билүүгө тийиш.* (Ж. Боконбаев)

Modal verb (*тийиш*) expresses the obligation.

If we look all the modal verbs in detail there we can see some grammatical differences. For example some modal verbs like (*балким, албетте, арийне, кыязы*) don't have any personal endings. But at the same time some modal verbs like (*өңдөңөт, шекилденет, сыяктанат*) can have personal endings: (*өңдөңөм, өңдөңөсүң, өңдөңөт, сыяктанам, сыяктанасың*). Modal verbs have syntactic peculiarities: (*албетте, арийне, балким*) don't have any syntactic connections with other words in the sentences. Modal verbs (*керек, балким*) can have grammatical meaning like an object: *Албетте, бизге бакыт-таалайды Совет бийлиги берди. Мекенди көздүн карегиндей сактоону баа жеткис ыйык милдет катары урматтоо керек.* Some modal verbs can have their own meanings in the sentences of the dialogue.

—*Партиянын чакырыгынаар дайым даярсынарбы?*—*Албетте.*

Differences and similarities of Kyrgyz and English modal verbs

Can denotes positive ability on the part of the doer. Besides ability, permission and theoretical possibility are expressed by using the modal auxiliary *can*.

I. Ability
I can swim.

In Kyrgyz *ability* is expressed with the “ал” which appears before tense/aspect markers and person marking and varies in accordance with the verb it is attached to. For the first person singular it is –м - in the present simple:

Мен сууда сүзө алам.

For the second person singular it is –а-сын,

-Сен сууда сүзө аласын,

For the second person plural it is –а- сы- ныз

For the third person – а-т

Ал сууда сүзө алат.

For the first person plural it is –а - быз—.

Биз сууда сүзө алабыз.

For the second person of the plural it is – а-сыздар

Сиздер сууда сүзө аласыздар.

For the third person of plural it is – ы –шат

Алар сууда сүзө алышат.

• **Past ability - could**

Past ability is expressed with the modal auxiliary *could* in English. The action is expressed by the lexical verb in both *can* and *could*. In other words, the basic meanings of *can* and *could* are that there are no obstructions to the action of lexical verbs of which *can* and *could* are auxiliaries; that is to say, the action is free to take place.

I could write in Spanish.

In negation it is always the meaning of *ability* that is negated; the results of past tense modification remain unaffected by negation.

It was not exactly panic they gave way to, but they could not just sit there.

Past ability in Kyrgyz is different from English. It is expressed by adding past ending— чу- and « эмес». Past ability personal endings.

Мен жаза алчу эмесмин.

First person singular: *эмесмин*

Second person singular: *эмесин*

Third person singular: *эмес*

First person plural: *эмеспиз*

Second person plural: *эмес*

Third person plural: *эмес*

• **Permission (might) (rare)**

Might I smoke here?

He said he might come in.

In the Kyrgyz language permission is expressed by words like: *уруксаат, мүмкүнбү, болобу*

Кириүүгө уруксаатпы?

(May I come in?)

Сиздин китебинизди алууга мүмкүнбү?

Бул жерде тамеки чегуугө мүмкүнбү?

1) **Giving information about the futures: predicting.**

The **shall /will** structure is used to give (or ask for) information about the future (in cases where there is no reason to use a present progressive or going to) and rendered into the Kyrgyz language with «жөнөкөй келээр чак» expressed by words; *болот, келет* etc. and *баяндагычынгай* of verbs.

For example:

- We shall need the money on the 15th.

- Бул акча бизге 15 ине керек болот.

- It'll be spring soon.

- Жакында жаз келет.

2) **Conditional use**

The **shall/will** structure is often used to express conditional ideas, when we say what will happen if something use happens.

He "ll have an accident if he goes on driving like that.

Ал машинаны ушундай айдай турган болсо, бир күнү кырсыкка учурашы мүмкүн.

(шарттуу ынгай) үчүнчү жак, жекелик түр.

If it rains the match will be cancelled.

Эгерде жаан жааса, оюн болой калышы ыктымал.

If you are not careful you'll fall

Эгерде сен этият болбосоң, жыгылып кетишиң мүмкүн.

If you leave me alone, I'll cry.

Сен мени жалгыз калтырып кетсең, мен ыйлаймын. (сурануу, өтүнүү, маанисин билдирип турат).

To translate this use of modals shall /will into Kyrgyz language we use mostly modal Wordof prediction in the Kyrgyz language such as: **мүмкүн, ыктымал, сыягы, кыязы** etc. And«шарттуу ынгай» the ending – **са** in the first and second person subject.

3) **“Predicting” the present or past**

We can use will to make a kind of prediction about the present or part – to say what we think is probably the case, or has probably happened.

Don't phone them now – they'll be having dinner.

Аларга азыр телефон чалба, алар балким тамактанып атышат.

“There's somebody at the door.” “That'll be the postman ”

Эшикке «кимдир – бирөө келди» - Ал почтальон окшойт

4) **Predictions as orders**

Predictions can be used a way of giving orders instead of telling somebody to do something, the speaker just says firmly that it will happen. This is common in military –style orders.

You will start to work at six o'clock sharp.

Сиз жумушуңузду так саат алтыда баштаңыз (ңыз, буйрук ынгай, жекелик түрү, келээр чак)

The regiment will attack at dawn.

Полк чабуулду күн чыгаарда баштайт (буйрук ынгай).

5) **Shall/will and present tenses:** both used often **shall/will** and present – tense form are possible with similar meanings. The choice depends on whether we want to emphasize present ideas like intention (certainty (present tenses)), or not (**shall/will**).

What will you do next year?

Сен келээрки жылы эмне кыласың?

All the family will be there?

Бүт үй-бүлөөлөр ал жакта болот.

If your mother comes, you'll have to help with the cooking.

Эгерде энең келсе, сен ага тамак бышырууга жардам беришиң керек.

Expressions of modal verbs from English into Kyrgyz languages in the novel “The Old Man and the Sea”

In this story Hemingway used short sentences that are written in simple and natural language. He almost always used concrete, specific, more common, casual and conversational words in his works. He preferred to use short sentences that rarely include adjectives and abstract nouns. However, he created a particular tension and rhythm in these sentences, which becomes more of an issue in the translations. Now we would like to analyze the expressing and using of modal verbs in the novel “The old man and sea” from English into Kyrgyz language.

—You **can not** fish and not eat.

БИШКЕК ГУМАНИТАРДЫК УНИВЕРСИТЕТИНИН ЖАРЧЫСЫ

—Ач карын тамак кармоого *болбойт*.

Here was used negative form of modal verb can not and in the translation it has the same equivalent *болбойт* which expresses inability or impossibility

—*Ким билсин*, бир кезде ал да биз сыяктуу кедей болгон чыгар, бизден жийиркенбей барар эле *балким*. (р. 9)

The author expressed uncertainty with the adverb *maybe* but in the Kyrgyz version uncertainty was expressed by two words *Ким билсин*, *балким* which are considered as a modal verb of the Kyrgyz language.

References

1. Anne Enquist, Laura Currie Oates „Just writing, grammar, punctuation, style for the legal writers“ New York 2001.
2. Baily Richard W. Burton, Dolores M. „English stylistics“ 1967.
3. Brian Lamont „First impressions“ Edinburgh (2005).
4. Biber, Douglas, Stig Johansson, Geoffrey Leech, Susan Conrad, and Edward Finegan. Longman Grammar of Spoken and Written English. Longman. 1999.
5. Close, R.A. A Teachers' Grammar: The Central Problems of English. Hove: LTP (1992).
6. Eastwood, John Oxford Learner's Grammar: Grammar Finder. Oxford: OUP (2005).
7. Ernest Hemingway (1983) “The old man and the sea”.
8. Galperin. I.R “Stylistics” Moscow (1971).
9. Galperin. I.R “ An essay in Stylistic Analyses” Moscow (1968).
10. Huddleston, Rodney, and Geoffrey K. Pullum (2002). The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language. Cambridge University Press.
11. Leech, Geoffrey N. (1971). Meaning and the English Verb. London: Longman.
12. Leech, Geoffrey N. (1969). Towards a Semantic Description of English. London: Longmans.
13. Lewis, Michael (1986). The English Verb: An Exploration of Structure and Meaning. Hove: LTP.
14. Mambaeva . S.K (2009) “Stylistics” Bishkek.
15. Palmer, Frank Robert (1988). The English Verb. Harlow: Longman.
16. Palmer, F. R.: 2001, Mood and Modality, Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics, second edn, Cambridge University Press.
17. Parrott, Martin (2000). Grammar for English Language Teachers.
18. Raymond Murphy “English grammar in use “ Cambridge University Press 1985.
19. Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech, and Jan Svartvik (1985). A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language. London: Longman.
20. Saeed, John I. (1997). Semantics. Blackwell.
21. The London School in Bishkek (2011) “Kyrgyz grammar”.
22. Yule, George (1998). Explaining English Grammar. Oxford: OUP.
23. Абдувалиев Ибраим (2008) “Кыргыз тилинин морфологиясы”.
24. Аракина В.Д. (2003) «Практический курс английского языка».
25. Арнольд (1973) «Стилистика современного английского языка»
26. Арнольд (1986) «Лексикология современного английского языка».
27. Бактыбек Токтубек уулу (2009) “Learn the Kyrgyz language”.
28. Давлетов. С. Кудайбергенов. С. (1980) “Азыркы Кыргыз тили” Морфология.
29. Дыйканов. К. (1980) “ Кыргыз тилинин тарыхынан”.
30. Гордон Е.М. и др. М., (1968) “Modality in Modern English”.
31. Кравченко. А.К., Ушакова. Л.В (1997) “The English verb. A new grammar for everyone”.
32. Смолина. М.В. М., 1977. “Наклонения английского языка”.
33. Расторгуева. Т.А., И.П. Верховская и др. М., (1987). “Английский глагол”.
34. Окснова. А.Б. Чыныбасва. Д.Т. Issyl Kul State University.
35. Шахова. Н.И. и др. “Наука”, (1980). “Learn to read science”.
36. Хемигуэй. Э. (1983) “ Чал жана дениз”.

Internet sources

- <http://www.google.com>
<http://content://com.sec.android.apps.sbrowser/readinglist/>
<http://bibliofond.ru/view.aspx?id=561003#1>
<http://www.helsinki.fi/vierien/series/volumes/01/nurmi>
http://aboutworldlanguages.com/turkibranch/altai_languages_family