

HEDGING DEVICES IN ENGLISH AND BEHDINI-KURDISH: A CONTRASTIVE STUDY

MAHDI TAWFIQ SADDIQ and SHIVAN SHLAYMON TOMA

Dept. of Translation, College of Languages, University of Duhok, Kurdistan Region-Iraq

(Received: March 12, 2023; Accepted for Publication : July 4, 2023)

ABSTRACT

This study presents a contrastive study of hedging devices in English and Behdini-Kurdish (also known as Northern Kurmanji). The appropriate identification, interpretation, utilization and translation of hedging devices are problematic for EFL learners and translators. Hedges are expressions used in speech and writing to avoid being committed to the truth conditionality of the statement, to express hesitation, to be uncertain, less direct, and to be polite. The study aims to provide a descriptive study of hedging in the two languages to identify similarities and differences between their hedging systems. This aim is achieved by reviewing some of the main classifications of the English hedges as the foundation for devising a classificatory system for hedges in Kurdish. Therefore, the study explores how hedging is voiced in both English and Kurdish and finds out that the English hedging system is more complex than the Kurdish one. Furthermore, it concludes that hedging in Kurdish is mostly lexicalized in nature due to the absence of epistemic modal auxiliaries as one of the main subcategories of hedging devices. The research also identifies another subclass of hedging devices which has not been addressed before in the available literature on hedging in the two languages. This subclass is the use of the plural forms of some numbers and date expressions which are used when the exact number or date is not known by the writer as (*thousands, millions, etc.*) and (*in the 1990s, etc.*).

KEYWORDS: Hedging Devices, Behdini-Kurdish, English Hedges, Epistemic Modal Auxiliaries.

1. INTRODUCTION

Acceptable and successful acts of communication require appropriate recognition and utilization of hedging devices. Speakers and writers use these devices for various purposes such as to avoid the commitment to the truth conditionality of the statement, to be hesitant and less direct in what they say and write and reflect their politeness towards their readers and listeners. English has received a rich literature in studying its hedging system as can be noticed from some works conducted by Salager- Meyer's (1994) and (1997), Hyland (1998), Varttala (2001), Fraser (2010), but Kurdish hedging system still needs to be investigated more. Apart from some available studies, such as Behnam & Khaliliakdam (2012), Moheddin & Sherwani (2019), and Abdul Aziz (2014), further investigations are required to enrich this field as Kurdish EFL learners and translators should be familiarized with hedging devices in English to be able to use them appropriately.

This study makes a major contribution to research on hedging devices by highlighting similarities and differences between hedging

devices in English and Behdini-Kurdish using translation. It suggests a more comprehensive classification for hedging devices in both languages and further proposes a new subclass to the available classifications of hedges (See 2.6.9), which has not been already mentioned by any scholar in the field. Moreover, it presents equivalences for English and Kurdish hedges through English into Kurdish translation and vice versa.

The paper is a contrastive study in nature which uses translation as a means for comparing and contrasting the hedging systems of English and Kurdish. Apart from the introduction section, the researcher defines the hedges, mentions some previous studies and classifications proposed by some scholars, and proposes a modified classification for hedges in English. Concerning hedges in Kurdish, the researcher mentions some previous studies and devises a classification for hedges in Behdini-Kurdish based on the English classifications.

Following is a more detailed account of the points mentioned here.

1.1. The problem

Appropriate recognition, utilization, and translation of English hedges are problematic

and challenging for Kurdish EFL Learners and translators. Many studies have been carried out on studying hedging devices in English. However, to the researcher's best knowledge, except Abdul Aziz (2014) which is a pragmatic case study, no attempt has yet been made for conducting a comprehensive contrastive study of hedging devices between English and Behdini-Kurdish. Behdini-Kurdish also lacks a classificatory system for classifying its hedging devices. Another expected area of hindrance is the lack of established and unified equivalence for English hedges in Kurdish; Moreover, some hedging devices such as modal auxiliaries are polysemous and multifunctional in nature and create problems for language users and learners. So, this study is an attempt to bridge the gap in this field.

1.2. The aim

The study aims to explore the similarities and differences between English and Kurdish hedges and suggests a more comprehensive classificatory system for both languages.

1.3. The research questions

The study will also attempt to answer the following research questions:

- 1- Does English possess a more complex hedging system than Kurdish?
- 2- What are the similarities and differences between English and Kurdish hedging devices?
- 3- What are hedging devices in Kurdish and how can they be classified?

1.4. The model adopted

In this investigation the researcher adopted an eclectic model for the classification of hedging devices in English based on the models of Salager-Meyer (1997) and Fraser (2010). The Kurdish class of hedges followed the modified taxonomy provided by hedged samples from speech and writing.

1.5. Data collection and procedures

Apart from the theoretical part, the research employs translation as a means for contrastive analysis of English and Kurdish hedging systems. The English and Kurdish source sentences are taken from written books and online references on hedging. The Kurdish and English translations have been provided by the researcher. These translations have been reviewed by two professional translators.

1.6. The limits of the study

The study is limited to contrasting some hedging devices between English and Behdini-Kurdish.

1.7. The value of the study

It is hoped that the present study will be useful theoretically and practically for researchers, teachers, lexicographers, translators, and students of linguistics and translation. It is worth investigating to call the teachers' attention to the fact that they need to pay more attention to building their students' competence for identifying hedging devices through teaching knowledge on hedging in English and Kurdish.

2. HEDGING DEVICES IN ENGLISH

Hedging devices in English have received significant theoretical and practical investigation. The upcoming subsections attempt to shed a brief light on some definitions, previous studies, and the classifications of these devices in English.

2.1. Terminology and definitions

Hedging devices have been termed differently by different scholars. They are called "weakeners" (Brown and Levinson, 1978), "approximators" and "shields" (Prince et al, 1982) "downtoners" (Holmes, 1982; Quirk et al, 1985), 'detensifiers' (Hubler, 1983) among others.

The term *hedge* or *hedging* can be broadly defined as a means of protection against something or somebody, avoiding a direct answer to a question, refraining from supporting an idea (OALD 2001: 603).

Lakoff (1972) was the first scholar who used the term "hedges" and defined them as expressions which make "things more or less fuzzy". She exemplifies them as *sort of, rather, kind of, more or less* etc. For instance, "A chicken is a sort of bird" is a hedged sentence (Lakoff 1972: 195).

Hyland (1998: 1) defines hedges as linguistic devices such as *I think, might, perhaps, may be* which we use in our speech or writing to avoid making categorical assertions. Moreover, it indicates the lack of complete commitment to the truth of a proposition (Hyland, 1998: 61-62).

According to Brown and Levinson (1978), hedges are strategies that minimize the threat of face threatening act in communication.

Fraser (2010) studied hedging and asserted that appropriate knowledge on the use and interpretation of hedges indicates the possession of pragmatic competence. He further defines pragmatic competence as the ability for communicating the intended message in its any socio cultural context. For him, hedging is a rhetorical strategy which reduces the semantic value of a statement as in *He is sort of nice* or attenuates the speech act force as in *I must ask*

you to stop doing that. These examples reveal that hedging is a semantic and pragmatic phenomenon. (Fraser, 2010:15)

Moreover, Fraser (2010:23) considers hedges as linguistic devices such as lexical (*sort of, technically, probably*), syntactic (tag questions, if conditional) devices and paralinguistic features like vocalizations (*aww, weeeell*), body language (dismissive wave of the hand).

In sum, hedging devices are expressions used by speakers or writers to avoid or lessen their commitment to the truthfulness of the statement. Their use indicates uncertainty, hesitation, fuzziness, indirectness. They can further be used as politeness strategies to save face and be polite.

2.2. Previous studies on hedging in English

Many studies have been carried out on hedging devices in different genres and on various text types. Some of them will be briefly mentioned here. For instance, hedging in academic discourse has been researched by Salager-Meyer (1994) through investigating hedges in 15 English medical papers. Some studies have been carried out by Hyland regarding the use and function of hedging over a period of time (1994, 1995, 1998, 2000, and 2008).

Varttala (2001) studied hedging in scientifically oriented texts in the three broad disciplines of economy, medicine, and technology. Regarding the use and recognition of hedging devices in academic writing, Mukheef (2012) examined Iraqi university students' recognition and production of hedging devices in their writing. The study was conducted on 100 fourth-year students at the English departments, colleges of Education, Universities of Babylon and Qadesiya. The researcher concluded that teaching knowledge on hedging devices is overlooked in curriculum.

Jamel (2021) explored the recognition of the semantic/pragmatic functions of hedges in scientific English writing by scientific college final year students. For this purpose, she conducted quantitative research on 71 subjects and found out that the students lack enough knowledge on distinguishing hedged and unhedged statements in scientific texts.

2.3. The uses of hedging devices

According to Lakoff (1972), Salager-Meyer's (1994) and (1997), Hyland (1998), Varttala (2001), Fraser (2010) hedges are used for the purposes stated below:

1- To express uncertainty.

2- To avoid asserting a factual statement when more evidence is needed as in the scientific discourse.

3- To be less direct.

4- To mitigate.

5- To achieve politeness, both positive and negative.

6- To express approximation.

7- To be fuzzy.

8- To express some degree of self-protection.

9- To reduce the lack of opposition.

10- To be more precise in reporting results in academic writing.

2.4. Modality and hedging in English

The most important concept that occurs within the realm of hedges is that of modality. Quirk et al (1985: 219) define modality as "the manner in which the meaning of a clause is qualified so as to reflect the speaker's judgment of the likelihood of the proposition it expresses being true." Based on this definition, modality signifies speaker's judgment on the events. They subclassify the modal verbs into intrinsic and extrinsic modals. The former expresses permission, obligation, and volition. The latter denotes possibility, necessity and prediction. Some modals have both intrinsic and extrinsic uses. For instance, the modal verb *may* expresses permission (intrinsic) and possibility (extrinsic). Furthermore, modals possess overlapping meanings. *Can* and *may* cover permission and possibility (Quirk et al, 1985: 220).

Based on the above definition of epistemic modality, it can be said that it is associated with hedging. This is further supported by Palmer (1990:2), Markkanen and Schroder (1997: 6) and Hyland (1998:2) who stated that epistemic modality modifies the commitment to the truth value of a proposition. Similarly, Simpson (1990:66-67) pointed out that modality reveals the degree of text producers' confidence on the truth of the ideational material they convey. In other words, modality assesses possibilities and probabilities and reduces the degree of liabilities and responsibility (Hubler, 1983:18).

It can be concluded that modality is a wider concept since it deals with epistemic and deontic modality and hedging is concerned with epistemic modality.

2.5. The classification of hedging devices in English

Hedging devices have been classified differently by different scholars. The taxonomies adopted by Prince et al (1982), Salager-Meyer

(1997), and Fraser (2010) are presented briefly in this section.

Prince et al (1982:20) classify hedges as presented in the following table:

Table(1):- Prince et al (1982:20) classification of hedging

Category	Subcategory	Example
1-Approximators (they are semantically oriented and adapt the propositional content)	Adapters	<i>Sort of, kind of</i>
	Rounders	<i>About</i>
2-Shields (they are pragmatically oriented and affect the degree and type of speaker's commitment)	Plausibility shields	<i>I think</i>
	Attribution shields	<i>According to her estimates,</i>

The above classification seems to be incomplete and technically difficult to comprehend and utilize. Furthermore, the available literature reveals that it has not received wide acceptance among the researchers.

In a more elaborated research, Salager-Meyer (1997) investigated hedges in scientific discourse and modified her classification of hedges (1994) providing a more clear-cut taxonomy as in the following table:

Table(2):- Salager- Meyer (1997) taxonomy

Category	Example
1-Modal auxiliary verbs	<i>may, might, can, could, would, should</i>
2-Modal lexical verbs	<i>to seem, to appear (epistemic verbs), to believe, to assume, to speculate, to suggest, to estimate, to tend, to think, to argue, to indicate, to propose).</i>
3-Adjectival, adverbial and nominal modal phrases	1. probability adjectives (<i>possible, probable, unlikely</i>) 2. nouns (<i>assumption, claim, possibility, estimate, suggestion</i>) 3. adverbs (<i>perhaps, possibly, probably, practically, likely, presumably, virtually, apparently</i>).
4-Approximators of frequency, quantity, degree, and time.	<i>(about, approximately, roughly, often, generally, usually, somehow, somewhat)</i>
5-Introductory phrases	<i>(I believe, we feel that)</i>
6-If clauses	<i>(if true, if anything)</i>
7-Compound hedges	1. double hedges (<i>it may suggest that</i>) 2. treble hedges (<i>it seems reasonable to assume that</i>); 3. quadruple hedges (<i>it would seem somewhat unlikely that</i>).

Fraser (2010:23-24) classifies hedges into the following categories

Table(3):- Fraser (2010) taxonomy

Category	Example
1-Adverbs/Adjectives	<i>(roughly, approximately, often, about, generally)</i>
2-Concessive conjunctions	<i>(though, although, while, whereas)</i>
3-Indirect Speech Acts	<i>(Could you close the door please?)</i>
4-Impersonal pronouns	<i>(one, it,...)</i>
5-Hedged performative	<i>(use of modal to hedged performative verb)</i>
6-Modal adjectives	<i>(probable, possible, un/likely,...)</i>
7-Modal adverbs	<i>(possibly, perhaps, probably,...)</i>
8-Modal verbs	<i>(might, can, would, could,...)</i>
9-Modal noun	<i>(suggestion, assumption, claim, possibility,...)</i>
10-Epistemic verbs	<i>(to assume, to suggest, to seem, to appear, etc.</i>
11-Reversal tag	<i>He's coming, isn't he? [I think he's coming]</i>
12-Negative question convey positive hedged assertion.	<i>Didn't Harry leave? [I think Harry left]</i>
13-Agentless Passive.	<i>Many of the troops were injured (...)</i>
14-Conditional subordinators	<i>(as long as, assuming that, given that)</i>
15-Conditional subordinators	<i>(as long as, assuming that, given that)</i>
16-Tentative Inference	<i>(The mountains should be visible from here).</i>
17-Progressive form	<i>(I am hoping you will come).</i>
18-Metalinguistic comment	<i>(strictly speaking, so to say, exactly, almost).</i>
19-Conditional clause refers to the condition under which the speaker makes the utterance.	<i>If you're going my way, I need a lift back.</i>
20-Compound hedges	based on Salager-Meyer (1997) mentioned above.

The above classifications, so far, indicate that there is no clear cut and close ended classificatory system. This view is supported by Clemen (1997 as cited in Fraser (2010: 23) as he comments:

There is no limit to the linguistic expressions that can be considered as hedges ...

The difficulty with these functional definitions is that almost any linguistic item

or expression can be interpreted as a hedge ... no linguistic items are inherently

hedges but can acquire this quality depending on the communicative context or

the co-text. This also means that no clear-cut lists of hedging expressions are possible.

So, hedges are limitless linguistic expressions which receive their hedging meaning based on the context of their use.

2.6. The adopted classification English Hedges in this study

Here an attempt is made to present a taxonomy of hedges which incorporates these elements in both speech and writing. However, the study will not discuss extralinguistic hedging devices.

2.6.1. Central modal auxiliaries as the main hedging devices

Central modal auxiliaries are the main means of expressing hedging in English. In what follows an attempt is made to shed a brief light on five central modals in the English modality system that function as hedging devices.

May/Might

The modal verbs *may* and *might* are commonly used to express possibility. Consider sentence (3-4) with its paraphrased form (it is to be noted that Kurdish translation is provided for every English sentence for comparative purposes).

(3) *They may be wrong.*

دبیت ئەو یێ شاش بن.

(4) *It is possible that they are wrong.*

مومکینه کو ئەو یێ شاش بن.

In (3), *may* expresses epistemic possibility. It denotes that the given proposition is possible to be true or become true. In this context, *may* is stressed and receives a fall-rise nuclear tone (Quirk et al., 1985:223).

Might as the past form of *may* also expresses possibility but with less certain sense of possibility and behaves like a tentative or unreal form (Palmer, 2001:58).

When *might* is used to mean epistemic possibility the meaning of the predication that

follows the modal verb is interpreted hypothetically as in (5).

(5) *He might have become a champion.*

دبیت ئەو بیته پالموان.

(*It was possible that he would have become a champion.*)

مومکینه کو ئەو بوو بیته په هلهوان.

Another use of *might* is in tentative possibility as in (6).

(6) *Of course, he might be wrong* (Quirk et al, 1985: 233).

چ پنهفت، دبیت ئەو یێ شاش بیت.

Moreover, the difference between *may* and *might* becomes neutralized when *might* is used in hypothetical or tentative sense. Thus, the speaker feels little or no difference of meaning. Examples (7) and (8) illustrate this point in a better way.

(7) *He may be wrong.*

دبیت ئەو یێ شاش بیت.

(8) *He might be wrong* (Quirk et al, 1985: 233).

دبیت ئەو یێ شاش بیت.

In addition to epistemic meaning *may* can be used to express permission (deontic meaning). For example, when someone asks permission to enter a room he would say:

(9) *May I come in?*

دستیری ههیه نهم بهیمه ژوورقه؟

Here *may* has acquired the deontic sense. Therefore, *may* is a multifunctional modal auxiliary verb.

Can/Could

These two modal verbs express possibility, permission and ability.

With respect to possibility, Quirk et al (1985:222) point out that when *can* is used to express possibility, we can paraphrase *it is possible to be* followed by an infinitival clause.

(10) *Even some expert pilots can make mistakes.*

دبیت هندهک فرۆکهفانتین شههرمزا ژێ شاشیان بکهن.

(11) *It is possible for some expert pilots to make mistakes.*

مومکینه هندهک فرۆکهفانتین شههرمزا شاشیان بکهن.

Sometimes, it can express future possibility and be paraphrased by *it will be possible*. Look at the example (12).

(12) *If it is snowing tomorrow, the match can be postponed.*

ئهگهر سو بهههه بهفر بباریت دبیت یاری بهینه پاشنێستن.

Concerning ability, *can* and *could* may be paraphrased by the verb phrases *be capable to*, *be able to*, *know how to*.

(13) *Can you mention his name?*

ئهههه تو دشههه ناههه وه بهههه؟

(14) *Are you able to mention his name?*

نەڕێ ته شیان هه‌مه نافی وی بیژی؟

As for permission, *can/could* expresses permission but in a less formal way than *may*. In the sense of permission, it is possible to use *be allowed to* or *permitted to* as in (15) to (17).

(15) *Can he borrow this pencil from you?*

نەڕێ نەڕ دشتیت ئەفی پینووسی ب قەر ژ ته وەر بگریت؟

(16) *Is he allowed to borrow this pencil from you?*

نەڕێ بی دەستوور دایه ئەفی پینووسی ژ ته وەر بگریت؟

(17) *Is he permitted to borrow this pencil from you?* (Quirk et al 1985: 222).

نەڕێ ئەو بی دەستور دایه ئەفی پینووسی ژ ته وەر بگریت؟

Could can be used to express:

a. hypothetical meaning as in (18).

(18) *If our team could win the match, they might be honored by the Queen.*

نەگەر تیما مه شیا فی یاریی بهت، دبیت ژ لای شازنی فه رنیز لی بهینه گرتن.

b. tentative permission (in polite requests)

(19) *Could I check your passport?*

نەڕێ ئەز دشم پاسپورتا ته ببینم؟

c. tentative possibility

(20) *There could be someone in the car.*

دبیت كهسهکی دناف ترومیالی دابیت.

d. polite directive and request

(21) *Could you please close your eyes?*

نەڕێ بی ز محمەت دشیی چاقتین خو بگری؟

In example (21) *could* does not denote an action in the past (Quirk et al, 1985: 233).

Must

The modal auxiliary *must* expresses logical necessity and obligation or compulsion.

Logical necessity

When *must* denotes logical necessity, its meaning is equal to *may* in the sense of epistemic possibility. Thus, we can label it epistemic necessity. It indicates that the speaker has made a conclusion based on what he knows or observes. This sense of *must* cannot be expressed in interrogative or negative clauses. This statement is further validated by Palmer (1990:2), who avers that there are three types of epistemic modality: speculative expresses uncertainty, deductive indicates an inference from observable evidence, and assumptive indicates inference from what is generally known. Sentence (22) illustrates this point in a better way.

(22) *The Johns must be wealthy.*

In sentence (22), a speaker concludes that the Johns must be rich since they possess a large villa and an expensive Toyota (Quirk et al, 1985:224-225).

It worth to mention that the above sentence (22) can also be translated into:

بی گومان خیزانا جونی زهنگین.

The back translation into English is rendered into:

Undoubtedly John's family is wealthy.

In the same line of thought, Vartalla (2001: 29) provided convincing evidence for considering *must* as a hedging device with the less degree of possibility than *may*.

Therefore, based on the above account, when *must* is used in such examples as (22) it is better to be rendered as a hedge into دبیت or چیدبیت rather than پیدقیه or دقت.

It is observed that the above mentioned central modal auxiliaries *may, might, can, could, and must* can be used as hedging devices in addition to their deontic sense.

2.6.2. Modal lexical verbs

These verbs are also called speech act verbs which express doubt and evaluation instead of just describing. They have also been referred to epistemic verbs. This class include *seem, appear, assume, tend, suggest, believe, propose, speculate, etc.* These verbs are highly used in academic writing. Consider the examples:

(23) *Our analyses suggest that a high dose of the drug can lead to relevant blood pressure reduction* (Salager – Meyer,1997: 132).

شروقه کرنین مه پشنیار دکهن کو دوزا بلندا دهرمانی دبیت ببینه نەگەرئ کیم کرنا فشارا خوینی.

2.6.3. **Modal adjectives** (*possible, (un)likely, probable, slight, considerable, rough, etc.*).

(24) *It is possible that....*

چیدبیت کو...

2.6.4. Modal adverbs

This subcategory includes: *perhaps, possibly, probably, practically, likely, presumably, apparently, etc.*

(25) *This is probably due to the fact that Greenland Eskimos consume diets with a high content of fish* (Salager – Meyer, 1997: 132).

رهنگه ئەفه ژ بهر وی راستیی بیت "نەسکیموئین گرین لاند" خوارنن زهنگین ب پیکهاتهی ماسیی دخون.

2.6.5 Modal nouns

They are such as *assumption, claim, possibility, estimate, suggestion, hypothesis, proposal, etc.*

(26) *Our hypothesis is that English tense system is more complex than Kurdish.*

گریمانا مه ئەفیه کو سیستهمی تینسا زمانی ئینگلیزی ئالوز تره ژ بی زمانی کوردی.

2.6.6. Approximators of degree, frequency, quantity, and time

This subclass includes: *approximately, about, roughly, often, generally, somewhat, sometimes, etc.*

(27) *Approximately 700 women die in the U.S. each year because of pregnancy or delivery complications, but an estimated 50% of these are preventable*ⁱ.

هەر سال نێزیکی 700 ژن ل ویلایهتین ئیکگرتی گیانی خو ژ دهست ددهن ژ بهر سهر بارکنین دووگیانی یان زارۆک بوونی، لئ دهنته تهخمینکرن کو دشیان دابه ریکری ل 50% ژ وان بهنته کرن.

2.6.7. Compound hedges

According to Salager – Meyer (1997: 133), compound hedges can be divided into the following classes:

a) Double hedges

(28) *It may suggest that.* ئەو دبیت پێشنیار بکەت

b) Treble hedges

(29) *It seems reasonable to assume that the team will win.*

یا بهر ناقل دیار دبیت کو گریمانە بکەمی کو تیم سهر بکەفیت.

c) Quadruple hedges

(30) *It would seem somewhat unlikely that John will tell anyone.*

تا رادیهیکی یا دویردیار دبیت کو جونی نێژبته ههر کەسهکی.

2.6.8. Conditional clauses such as *if, unless, given that, assuming that, as long as, etc.*

(31) *Unless the strike has been called off, there will be no trains tomorrow.* Fraser (2010: 24)

ئەگەر مانگرتن ب دوماهیك نههین، سو بههی چ شهمندهفر ناین.

2.6.9. Plural form of some numbers and date expressions

In English the plural form “*thousands*” refers to the numbers between 2000 - 9999. It is used when a speaker is not quite sure about the exact number or amount of something they are referring to. Thus, this lack of confidence and uncertainty can be considered hedging. The same is true when the speaker uses dates in their plural form as in “in the 1990s”. Sometimes, the speaker cannot specify or does not know the exact year in which an event had taken place. So, this format is used. Consider the following examples:

هزاران: *thousands*، ملیونهها: *millions*، ل سالین 1980
یان دا: *in the 1980s*

(32) *Hundreds, if not thousands, of interview requests are flooded in.*ⁱⁱ

سهدان ئەگەر نه هزاران داخوایین چاڤیکهفتنی بین گههشتین.

(33) *One thousand people died in the earthquake .*

هزار کەس د ئهههژیدا گیانی خو ژ دهست دان.

In the first sentence *thousands* is a hedging device while in the second it is not since there is no doubt on the number.

2.6.10. Reversal tags

(34) *She's coming. Isn't she? (I think she's coming).*

ئەو یا دهنت. ما نه ومیه؟ (ئەز هزر دکەم ئەو یا دهنت).

2.6.11. Negative question which conveys positive hedged assertion

(35) *Didn't John leave? I think John left.*

ما جون نهچوو؟ ئەز هزر دکەم جون چوو.

2.6.12. Agentless passive

(36) *Many people were killed.*

گلهک کەس هاتنه کوشتن.

2.6.13. Indirect speech acts

(37) *Could you please pass me the bread?*

بێ زحمەت نشینی ئانی ب دهیه ف من؟

2.6.14. Impersonal pronoun

Someone, anyone, somebody, one, etc.

(38) *One can imagine that....*

مرۆف دشتیت تهخهبولی بکەت کو

From the above mentioned classifications, it can be pointed out that modal auxiliaries (*may, might, can, could, must, would*), modal verbs (*seem, appear, tend, think, believe*), adverbials (*approximately, sometimes, perhaps, about*), adjectives (*likely, slight, rough, considerable, possible*), Compound hedges (*it seems possible, would seem likely*), conditional clauses (*if constructions*) are some of the main classes of hedging devices.

3. HEDGING AND MODALITY IN KURDISH

Some studies have been conducted on hedging in Kurdish. However, they have not been able to provide a clear-cut classification and a satisfactory contrastive study of this phenomenon between English and Kurdish. In this section, some of the conducted studies on hedging will be briefly referred to.

Behnam and Khaliliaqdam (2012) studied the use of hedging devices in Sorani Kurdish spoken discourse. They concluded that Kurdish and English hedges perform the same function.

Abdul Aziz (2014) investigated hedges in Kurdish with reference to English. The Kurdish samples are taken from a Kurdish play. The researcher found out that hedging is both a semantic and pragmatic phenomenon. The study can be regarded as an early attempt for investigating Behdini-Kurdish hedges. However, a case study is not enough for studying and

exemplifying hedging in Kurdish and no classificatory system has been suggested by the researcher for Kurdish hedges.

Moheddin and Sherwani (2019) conducted a study on hedging devices in political speeches of President Masud Barzani. The hedges were investigated pragmatically focusing on their function rather than form. The researchers adopted Prince et al's (1982) model of hedging devices. It was found that adapters (ب تەواوی) 'totally', 'very', 'more', 'زیاتر', 'some', 'هه‌ندەک', 'etc.) Attribution shields (Because of... 'له بەر ئەمە' 'Because of our customs... the plausibility shields (I consider', 'هه‌یوادارم', 'we are hopeful', and 'هه‌یوادارم' 'we all hope') were mostly used. Adapters rank first followed by shields. Rounder hedges have not been employed to indicate the unwillingness of the speaker in revealing personal doubts and direct involvement.

Regarding modality, it has not received enough attention in Behdini-Kurdish. One of the studies has been conducted by Ahmed (2005) who presented a syntactic study of modality without providing a clear status of forms and functions of modal expressions. For him, modal expressions are part of a broad class of mood markers which can be called rizhe form. In the Behdini dialect, modal verbs have lost their grammatical function and are invariable in form (they do not inflect for number, tense and aspect). They usually occur at the beginning of the simple sentence and are used to express the speaker's attitude. Since they occur outside the sentence, they are not auxiliary verbs. As in the following example:

(39) دقیت نەز بچم.

a. *I must go.*

(40) چۆن بچم.

b. *I may go.* (Ahmed, 2005:6)

For Toma and Simo (2020), Behdini-Kurdish does not have a distinctive class of modal verbs similar to English. In Kurdish, various means such as particles (دبیت، رهنه، چۆن، پێدقییه) phrases (دشیان دایه) and lexical verbs (دشیت) are used to express modality (Toma and Simo, 2020: 64).

3.1. The classification of hedging devices in Kurdish

To the researcher's best knowledge, no classification has been suggested for classifying hedges in Kurdish. The following categorization represents some of the main classes of hedging devices in Behdini-Kurdish:

3.1.1. Modal expressions

Modal expressions such as (چۆن، رهنه، دبیت) are mostly used to express hedging. They usually occur at the beginning of the simple sentences and in the dependent clauses of complex sentences. But the negative forms (چنابیت، نایبیت) only express obligation (prohibition). (چۆن، دبیت) can also be used to express permission. Arabic loan words (نەحتماله، مومکینه) express possibility. Moreover, sometimes, (بەلکو or بەلکی) are mistakenly used as equivalents to the conjunction *but*. It is worth to mention that (بەلکی or لێ) are the established equivalents of *but*.

(41) دبیت گیانه‌مران شیانین ناشکراننا ئێر ده‌ه‌شان ب دووراتیا 12 میلان ژ سه‌ته‌ری ئێر ده‌ه‌شێ هه‌ینⁱⁱⁱ.

Animals may have the ability to predict earthquakes 12 miles away from the epicenter.

(42) رهنه‌ چهند سه‌له‌کا نه‌ نه‌ف نه‌خوشیه هه‌بیت، بێی تو هه‌ست پێ بکه‌ی^{iv}.

You may have been infected with this disease for some years and not to feel it.

3.1.2. Modal nouns

(suggestion) ، پێشنیار، (opinion) بۆچوون ، (hypothesis) گریمانه (estimation) ، (هه‌له‌سه‌نگاندن، expectation) پێشبینی (view) ب دیتن،

(43) ب بۆچوونا من به‌ایی دولاری دێ بلند بیت.

In my opinion dollar prize will rise.

3.1.3. Modal adjectives

نزیك (possible) ، مومکن ، (significant) به‌رچاف ، (general) ، گشتی ، (slight) ، کیم ، (close) ، (reasonable) ، etc.

(44) به‌ایی بۆرۆ داکه‌ته‌کا به‌رچاف تو مار کر

Euro witnessed a considerable decline.

3.1.4. Modal adverbs

This category of adverbs can be divided into:

3.1.4.1. Probability adverbs:

(likely) ، نه یا دووره (unlikely) یا دووره (possibly) etc. (نیهتماله) ، (maybe)

(45) یا دویره کو بیهه کاندیدهکی باش بۆ هه‌لبزارتان.

He is unlikely to be a good candidate for the elections.

3.1.4.2. Adverbs of frequency

(often) ، پتریا جار ، (sometimes) جار جار ، هه‌ندەک جار (46) تا د بارا پتریا که‌یس ئومیگروونی یا هه‌ی و هه‌ندەک جار فشارا خوینی ژێ بلند دبیت.

Fever is present in the most cases of Omigran and sometimes blood pressure will rise.

3.1.4.3. Adverbs of degree

(relatively) به‌رچاف (ب شیوهیهکی رێژمیی) ، (somewhat ، to a certain extent) تا رادیهک (significantly) ، etc.

(47) پێشبینی ده‌یه‌ کرن ناستنی بیهینی تا رادیهکی کیم بیت.

It is expected that the degree of vision be reduced to a certain extent.

- <https://www.bu.edu/wheelock/files/2010/10/2010-Pragmatic-Competence-The-Case-of-Hedging.pdf>
- Holmes, J. (1982). "Expressing doubt and certainty in English". *RELC*, 13, pp.19-28
<http://rel.sagepub.com/content/13/2/9>
- Hornby, A.S. (2000). *Oxford advanced learners dictionary of current English*. (6th ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hubler, A. (1983). *Understatements and hedges in English*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Hyland, K. (1998). *Hedging in scientific research articles*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Lakoff, G. (1972). Hedges: A study of meaning criteria and the logic of fuzzy concepts. In Peranteau, P., J. Levi and G. Phares (Eds.). *Papers from the eight regional meeting of Chicago linguistic society*. (pp.183 – 228). Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Markkanen, R. and Schroder, H. (1997). *Hedging and discourse: Approaches to the analysis of a pragmatic phenomenon in academic texts*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Moheddin, K. & Sherwani, K. (2019). Hedges Used in Kurdish Political Discourse. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*. 23. 648-657.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.37200/IJPR/V23I3/PR190354>
- Mukheef, R. N. (2012). Investigating knowledge and use of Iraqi EFL university learners of hedging devices. *Journal of University of Babylon*, 20(3), 745-779.
<https://www.iasj.net/iasj/download/907ca4a821ea0ed9>
- Palmer, F. (1990). *Modality and the English modals*. (2nd ed.). London: Longman.
- (2001). *Modality and the English modals*. (4th ed.). London: Longman.
- Prince, E., J. Frader and C. Bosk (1982). On hedging in physician-physician discourse, in R. J. Di Pietro (Ed.), *Linguistics and the professions*. Proceedings of the second annual delaware symposium on language studies. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 83-97.
http://www.cs.columbia.edu/~prokofieva/CandidacyPapers/Prince_Hedging.pdf
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartivik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Salager-Meyer, F. (1994). Hedges and textual communicative function in medical English written discourse. *English for Specific Purposes*, 13, 149-170.
- (1997). I think that perhaps you should: A study of hedges in written scientific discourse. *Functional Approaches to Writtent text: Classroom applications*, 105-118.
https://www.tesol-france.org/uploaded_files/files/TESOL%20V2N2%20C8%20I%20think%20that%20Perhaps.pdf
- Salih, R.R (2014). *A comparative study of English and Kurdish connectives in newspaper opinion articles*. Unpublished PhD Dissertation, School of English, University of Leicester.
https://leicester.figshare.com/articles/thesis/A_comparative_study_of_English_and_Kurdish_connectives_in_newspaper_opinion_articles/10159589
- Shwani, R. (2003). *Amrazî bestinewe le zimanî Kurdîda. [connective devices in Kurdish]* unpublished Doctoral dissertation . Zankoy Silêmanî.
- Simpson, P. (1990). "Modality in literary – critical discourse". In: W. Nash (Ed.), *The writing scholar: studies in academic discourse*. Newbury Park: Sage, (pp.63-94).
- Toma, Sh.Sh. & Simo. H.I.A. (2020). Modality in English and Kurdish: A contrastive study. *Journal of University of Duhok*. Humanities and Social Sciences, 23(1), (pp.63-70)
<https://journal.uod.ac/index.php/uodjournal/article/view/689>
- Varttala, P. (2001). *Hedging in scientifically oriented discourse: Exploring variation according to discipline and intended audience*. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation. University of Tempere.
<http://acta.uta.fi/pdf/951-44-5195-3.pdf>.
- Endnotes
ⁱ <https://orwh.od.nih.gov/mmm-portal/what-mmm>
ⁱⁱ <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/thousand>
ⁱⁱⁱ <https://gavtv.net/ku/2698>
^{iv} <https://gavtv.net/ku/3617>
^v <https://www.basnews.com/so/babat/580647>
^{vi} <https://www.facebook.com/noshnews/posts/2741263536087735/>
^{vii} <http://www.rwangauraxna.com/ba/detail.aspx?IDNews=5070>

پۆخته

ئەفە قەكۆلینەكا هەقەبركیه ل سەر ئامرازین خۆلادانی د زمانین ئینگلیزی و كوردیا به هیدینیدا، كو ب كرمانجیا باكور ژى دهیتە ناكرن. نیاسین، تیگه ههشتن، بكارهینان و وهگیرانا ئامرازین خۆلادانی، ئاریشهیه بۆ فیروازیین كوردین زمانن ئینگلیزی و كه سین وهگیر. خۆلادان ئاماژه ددهته ئەو زاراقتن، كو د ئاخرتن و نقیسینیندا دهینه بكارهینان بۆ خۆ دویر ئیخستن ژ پابه ندبوون ل سەر مه رجین راستیا گوتنی، بۆ دهربرینا دوودلی، نه پشتراست بوونی، نه راسته خوو بوونی و ب ئەدهب بوونی. مه ره م ژ ئەقی قه كۆلینن ئەوه، كو خواندنه كا وه سفی ل سەر خۆلادان د هەر دوو زماناندا بۆ دیاركرنا وه كه هقی و جیاوازیان د ناقه را سیسته مین خۆلادانا واندا پیشكیش بكه ت. ئەف ئارمانجه ب رپكا پیداجوونا هنده ك پولینین گرنگین زاراقتن خۆلادانی د زمانن ئینگلیزیدا، وه ك بنه مایه ك بۆ دانانا سیسته مه كی پولینكرنن بۆ ئامرازین خۆلادانی د زمانن كوردیدا ب ده سته دهیت. ژبه ر قی چه ندی ئەف قه كۆلینه دیار دكه ت، كو چه وا خۆلادان د زمانین ئینگلیزی و كوردیدا دهیته دهربرین و قه دبینیت كو سیسته می خۆلادانا زمانن ئینگلیزی ئالووژتره ژ یا زمانن كوردی. زیده بارن قی چه ندی دگه هیته قی ئەنجامی، كو سروشتن خۆلادان د زمانن كوردیدا بارا پتر زارا قه بیه ژبه ر نه بوونا ریژه فورمین هاریكارین (ئیبستیمیک) وه ك ئیک ژ گرنگترین به ش پولین ئامرازین خۆلادانی. ههروه سا ئەف خواندنه به ش پوله كا دیتر ژ دهربرینن خۆلادانی دده ته نیاسین، كو دیولینن زمانین ئینگلیزی و كوردیدا ئاماژه پین نه هاتیه كرن ئەو ژى هنده ك ژماره و زاراقتن دهربرینن میژووینی نه و دهینه بكارهینان، ل ده می نقیسه ر ژماره و میژوویا دروست نزانیت وه ك: (هزاران، ملیونان،... هتد) و (د سالتن هزارو نه هسه د و نوتاندا،... هتد).

زاراقتن سه ره كی: ئامرازین خۆلادانی، كوردیا به هیدینی، خۆلادانین ئینگلیزی، ریژه فورمین هاریكارین (ئیبستیمیک).

الخلاصة

تقدم هذه الدراسة دراسة مقارنة لأدوات التحوط في اللغة الإنجليزية واللغة الكردية البهدينية (المعروفة أيضاً باسم الكرمانجية الشمالية). يعتبر تحديد وسائل التحوط وتفسيرها واستخدامها وترجمتها مشكلة بالنسبة لمتعلمي ومترجمي اللغة الإنجليزية كلغة أجنبية. والتحوطات هي التعبيرات المستخدمة في الكلام والكتابة لتجنب الالتزام بشرطية الحقيقة للبيان، وللتعبير عن التردد، ولكي يكون المرء غير مؤكداً، وأقل مباشرة، وأن يكون مهذباً. تهدف الدراسة إلى تقديم دراسة وصفية للتحوط باللغتين للتعرف على أوجه التشابه والاختلاف بين أنظمة التحوط الخاصة بهما. يتم تحقيق هذا الهدف من خلال مراجعة بعض التصنيفات الرئيسية للتحوطات الإنجليزية كأساس لابتكار نظام تصنيفي للتحوطات باللغة الكردية. لذلك تستكشف الدراسة كيف يتم التعبير عن التحوط باللغتين الإنجليزية والكردية وتكتشف أن نظام التحوط الإنجليزي أكثر تعقيداً من النظام الكردي. علاوة على ذلك، يخلص إلى أن التحوط باللغة الكردية هو في الغالب معجمي بطبيعته بسبب عدم وجود إضافات نمطية معرفية كواحدة من الفئات الفرعية الرئيسية لأدوات التحوط. يحدد البحث أيضاً فئة فرعية أخرى من أدوات التحوط التي لم يتم تناولها من قبل في الدراسات المتوفرة حول التحوط باللغتين. هذه الفئة الفرعية هي استخدام صيغ الجمع لبعض الأرقام وتعبيرات التاريخ التي يتم استخدامها عندما لا يعرف الكاتب الرقم الدقيق أو التاريخ مثل (بالآلاف، الملايين، إلخ) و (في التسعينيات، إلخ).

الكلمات الدالة: أجهزة التحوط، الكردية البهدينية، التحوط باللغة الإنجليزية، الأفعال المساعدة المعرفية.