

## MODALITY IN ENGLISH AND KURDISH: A CONTRASTIVE STUDY

SHIVAN SHLAYMOON TOMA and HAVAL ISMAIL AHMAD SIMO

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

*(Received: March 22, 2020; Accepted for Publication: May 17, 2020)*

### 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.

**KEYWORDS:-** Modality, Epistemic Modality, Deontic Modality, Behdini Kurdish, Modal Auxiliaries

### 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 Larsen-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 modal 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.

رووناھینن مالا جیسونی دھمرینه، پندقیه (بیگومان) نه نوکه لسهر جهی نقتتی بیت.

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

رووناھینن مالا جیسونی دھمرینه، پندقیه (بیگومان) نه نوکه د مالقه نینه.

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.

جیسون پندقیه (بیگومان) ل سهر جهی نقتتییه.

4. Jason is at bed.

جیسون بی لسهر جهی نقتتی.

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 (پندقیه، دقتیت، دبیت، رهنگه) (شیان) (دشیت)، phrases (د شیان دایه (هههه، د شیان دایه (دشیت) and lexical verbs (دشیت).

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.

a) نازاد دشیت گهلهک ب لهز چاپی بکهت.

b) نازادی شیانین چاپکرنا گهلهک بلهز بین ههین.

6. I **should** sleep early tonight.

a) پندقیه نهز نهف شهفه زوی بنفم.

b) دقتیت نهز نهف شهفه زوی بنفم.

7. The phone **may** be on the table.

a) موبایل دبیت لسهر میزئ بیت.

b) موبایل رهنگه لسهر میزئ بیت.

c) د شیان دایه کو موبایل لسهر میزئ بیت.

d) موبایل چنیدبیت لسهر میزئ بیت.

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 (دشیت) and the phrase (شیانین ... ههین) as a translation for *can*, the particle (پندقیه) as a translation for *should*, and particles (دبیت), (رهنگه), and (چنیدبیت), and the phrase (د شیان دایه) 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," and
- 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, and 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 & Courane, 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.

ئەلفرێد چێدبیت (رهنگه - دبیت) نەمی خێز اندار بیت.

9. Alfred must be unmarried.

(a) ئەلفرێد پێدقییه نەمی خێز اندار بیت.

(b) ئەلفرێد بیگومان نەمی خێز اندار.

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 Auwera & 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 (Querk 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.

دیبیت (چیندیبیت) تو یی راست بی.

b. He may go to London every day.

رهنگه (چیندیبیت) ئەو هەر رۆژ دچیتە باژیری لهندن.

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 a 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.

هەلبەت دیبیت (چیندیبیت) ئەز یی شاش ب.

b. So he might go and live with his parents for a while.

ئەفجاً رهنگه (چیندیبیت) ئەو بچیت دگەل دەیکو بائین خۆ بژیەت بۆ ماو مەیکێ.

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.

دیبیت (چیندیبیت) تو یی شاش بی.

b. You might be wrong.

رهنگه (چیندیبیت) تو یی 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?

ئەری تو دبیژی ئەو د بیهنقەدانێ دا بن؟

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

14. May we be doing him an injustice?

(a) ئەری تو بیژی ئەم یی ئەدادوهری دگەل وی ئەنجام دەین؟

(b) ئەری چیندیبیت ئەو ئەم لێ دکەین ئەدادپەر وەر ییە؟

#### 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?

ئەری دیبیت ئەو د رژد بن؟

b. What can they be doing?

ئەری ئەو یی چ دکەن؟

c. Where can she have put it?

ئەری ئەو یی ئەفە دانایە کیری؟

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) دیبیت راگر ل ئوفیسا خۆ بیت.

(b) رهنگه راگر ل ئوفیسا خۆ بیت.

(c) د شیان دایە کو راگر ل ئوفیسا خۆ بیت.

(d) چیندیبیت راگر ل ئوفیسا خۆ بیت.

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 (دیبیت), (رهنگه), (د شیان دایە), (لهوانیە), etc. (Sabir, 2008).

The Kurdish two forms of (دبیت) and (رهنگه) are probably the closest equivalents of *may* in English. Their use is usually susceptible to certain syntactic restrictions as shown below:

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

17. a. دبیت / چندبیت نازاد ل مال بوو.

b. (رهنگه) / چندبیت نازاد ل مال بوو. (Azad may have been at home.)

b. (دبیت), (چندبیت), and (رهنگه) can be followed by a nominal (non-verbal) sentence introduced by the Ezafe particle *بی* as in (18).

18. نازاد دبیت / چندبیت / رهنگه بی ل مال. (Azad may be at home.)

As for the modal phrase (د شیان دایه), it usually introduces the sentence and it is followed by the complementizer (کو) as in (19).

19. د شیان دایه کو تیما مه ئەف شەفە بسمە کەفیت. (Our team may win tonight.)

Let us consider example (20).

20. The dean must be at his office.

بێگومان راگر بی ل ئوفیسا خۆ.

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 paraphrase can be as follows:

(a) راگر پندقییه ل نفیسینگهها خۆ بییت.

(b) راگر دقیت ل نفیسینگهها خۆ بییت.

(c) بێگومان راگر بی ل نفیسینگهها خۆ.

(d) پێ نهفیت راگر بی ل نفیسینگهها خۆ.

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 (پندقییه), (دقییت), بێگومان, پێ نهفیت.

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 (دقییا با, یا پندقی بوو). This is exemplified in (21).

21. The dean must have been at his office.

(a) راگر دقیا با ل نفیسینگهها خۆ بییت.

(b) یا پندقی بوو کو راگر ل نفیسینگهها خۆ بییت.

## 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.

### 4.2.1 Permission

The modal auxiliaries of *may* and *can* are used to express permission. For instance:

22. They may come in.

(a) ئەو دشین بهینه ژوورفە.

(b) ئەو دەستویردایه داکو بهینه ژوورفە.

(c) وان روخسەتا هەمی بهینه ژوورفە.

23. You can see her now.

(a) تۆ دشتی نوکه وئ ببینی.

(b) تۆ بی دەستویردای نوکه وئ ببینی.

It is to be noted that *may* sounds more formal than *can* according to Palmer (1990: 78). Also, *can* is more frequent in speech when it comes to expressing permission. In Kurdish, it is not easy to find exact equivalents to *may* and *can* with this stylistic variation. However, *can* is best translated into (دشتیت) and *may* into (دستویردایه, (روخسەت هەمی).

### 4.2.2 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 دئ وئ ب دروستاهی کەمی، ئەوا ئەز دبیژم.

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.

ئەو دئ پارئ خۆ وەرگرت نیکسەر پستی بدستفەینانا وی پارە.

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.

دئ سەر خاترا قئ چەندئ، تۆوشی نازاران بی.

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

27. The 1947 act shall have effect as if this section were included in part III thereof.

یاسایا (۱۹۴۷) دئ یا کارپیکری بیت، هس و مکی ئەش  
برگه ل پشکا سین د قن یاساین دا یا چسپاندی بیت.

In (27), *shall* shows more restriction in its use. As clear, it is used with a third person singular subject to express some legal regulations (Querck et al, 1985: 230).

As for interrogation, two characteristics are attributed to *shall* by Querck et al (1985: 815), which are:

(a) *Shall* almost always occurs with 1<sup>st</sup> person subjects as in (28).

28. Shall we have dinner? Yes, let's.

ئەری ئەم شیفی بخۆین؟ بەلی، دا بخۆین.

(b) The question using *shall* is not necessarily symmetrical with its answer because it is not repeated in the response. And the expected answer is either agreement or a 2<sup>nd</sup> person imperative, as in (29).

29. Shall we carry our suitcases? Yes, please do so.

ئەری ئەم دشتین چانتین خۆ هەلبگرین؟ بەلی، کەرممکەن  
و ه بکەن.

In Kurdish, the modal particle (دئ) is widely employed to give an undertaking including, for instance, a guarantee, a threat, or even a promise as shown in (30).

30. a. (A guarantee: I shall sell it to you).

b. (A threat: Be careful, you shall regret; it is up to you).

c. (A promise: I promise I shall help you.)

#### 4.2.3 Necessity/ Obligation

When necessity and/or obligation are used in a deontic sense, the modals of *must*, *should*, and *ought to* are used in English. Consider examples in (31), (32), and (33).

31. The students must be more careful about the exams.

(a) پێدقییه قوتابی پتر د هشیار بن سهبارت ئەزمونان.

(b) دقیت قوتابی پتر د هشیار بن سهبارت ئەزمونان.

32. We should report to the police right now.

(a) پێدقییه ئەم نوکه ناگه هداریا پولیسان بکەین.

(b) دقیت نوکه ناگه هداریا پولیسان بکەین.

33. He ought to see a doctor immediately.

(a) پێدقییه ئەم دەم ل دەست سەرمەدانا نوژداری بکەت.

(b) دقیت ئەم دەم ل دەست سەرمەدانا نوژداری بکەت.

It is to be noted that in English, usually the modal auxiliary *must* expresses a stronger obligation than *should* and *ought to*, which are used for a mild obligation.

In Kurdish, on the other hand, (پێدقییه) and (دقیت) 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 (پێدقییه، چیدبییت، دقیت، دبیت، رەنگه) phrases (دشتیت) (شیان هەمه، دشیان دایه) and lexical verbs (دشتیت).

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 (دبیت), (چیدبییت), (رەنگه), and (د) (شیان دایه), whereas the items used as equivalents to *must* include (پێدقییه), (دقیت), (بێگومان), and (بی) (نەقیت).

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 (دشتیت), (دەستویردایه), and (روخسەت هەیه), for *shall* the equivalent is (دئ), and for *must*, *should*, and *ought to* are (پێدقییه) and (دقیت).

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* can show both ability and permission and so forth. In Kurdish, on the other hand, this overlap in meaning is almost only shown with (دشتیت), 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.

## REFERENCES

- Ahmed, B, O. (2005). *Darbîrî Reža la Diālektî Žurwi Zimānî Kūrdîdā [expressing mood in the northern dialect of Kurdish]*. Unpublished Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Saladdin.
- Bell, R. (1991). *Translation of Translating: Theory and Practice*. Essex: Longman.
- Berk, L. (1999). *English Syntax: From Word to Discourse*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bomba, R.M. (2001). *Kirdārî Îlzāmî (wist w ārazw) la Zimānî Kūrdîdā Diālektî Kirmānjî Nāwrast [The Subjunctive Verb in Kurdish –In the Central Dialect]*. Unpublished MA Thesis. University of Sulaimani.
- Celece-Murcia, M. and Larsern-Freemen, D. (1999). *The Grammar Chandra Bose, A. (2005). The Problems in Learning Modal Auxiliary* Coates, J. (1983). *The Semantics of the Modal Auxiliaries*. London: Croom Helm. *Dissertation*, <http://www.languageinIndia.com/nov2005/cha ndrabo ee1.html>.
- Goossens, L. (1979). *The English modal verb can: an open-ended semantic perspective*. In S. De Vriendt & C. Peeters (eds.) *Linguistics in Belgium II*: 85- 93. Brussels.
- Hacquard, V. and Cournane, A. (2016). *Themes and variations in the expression of modality*. @inproceedings{Hacquard2016ThemesAV, Book. Boston: Heinle and Heinle.
- Halliday, M. (1970). *Functional Diversity in Language as Seen from a Consideration of Modality and Mood in English*. Chapter 5 in “Studies in English Language.” Vol. 7.
- Kreidler, C. (1999). *Introducing English Semantics*. London: Routledge.
- Leech, G. (1987). *Meaning and the English Verb*. (2nd ed.). Longman: London and New Linguistic Typology, 2, 79-124.
- Lyons, J. (1977). *Semantics*. Vol. 2. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. *Modality and Mood in English*. In *Foundations of Language* 6. 322-361
- Palmer, F. (1990). *Modality and the English Modals*. (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). London: Longman.
- Palmer, F. (2001). *Modality and the English Modals*. (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). London: Longman.
- Quirk, R. and S. Greenbaum (1973). *A University Grammar of English*. Essex: Longman.
- Quirk, R., Greenbaum, S., Leech, G., & Svartvik, J. (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English language*. London: Longman.
- Sabir, P.H.S. (2008). *Investigating the syntactic and semantic mastery of English auxiliaries by Kurd learners at college level*. An MA Thesis: University of Sulaimani.
- Steel, S., Akmajian, A., Demers, R., Jelinek, E., Kitagawa, C., Clerk, R., Wasow, T. (1981). *An Encyclopedia of AUX: a Study in Cross Linguistic Equivalence*. Cambridge: MIT Press.
- Van der Auwera, J. and Plungian, V. (1998). *On modality’s semantic map. Verbs in English at High School Level*. Unpublished Ph. D. York.

### پۆخته

نهقی فهكۆلینی ههول ددهت شلوقهكرنهكا بهراورد لسهه چهمكن چاوانین (Modality) دنافههرا ههردوو زمانین نینگلیزی و كوردی دا نههجام بدهت. ناریشا فهكۆلینی د هندی دا دیار دبیت كو فیرخواز و قوتابین كورد ل ههردوو بهشین وهركیران و زمانن نینگلیزی ل كولیژا زمانان ل زانكویا دهوك بهرهنگارییا زههمهتی و ناستهنگان دین دهبراهی فیربوونا چاوانین د زمانن نینگلیزی دا بگشتی و كارین هاریكارین چاوانین بتایهتی. چاوانی جورهكه ژ جورین رامانن بین كو دهینه بكارنinan بو دهبرینا پیدقیاتی و ریتتچوونی. نارمانجین سهههکی بین قن فهكۆلینی وهسفرنا ههردوو جورین چاوانیه: یا زانینی (epistemic modality) و یا نهدهبی (deontic modality) د ههردوو زمانن ناماژهپیکری ب مهههما دهستنیساتکرنا خالین وهکههقی و جیاوازیی دنافههرا ههردوو زمانان دا سهبارت چاوانین. نههجامین فهكۆلینی ددهنه دیارکران كو نامرازین چاوانین بین سهههکی د زمانن نینگلیزی دا كارین هاریكارین ریزمانینه، بهلی د زمانن كوردی دا پتریا دهمان توخمین فهههنگینه، نهفجا كومهكا جوراوجور یا توخمین فهههنگی دهینه بكارنinan ژبو دهبرینا نیک کارئ هاریکارئ زمانن نینگلیزی. فهكۆلین ب ژمارهكا دههههجام و راسپاردان ب دوهاهیک دهیت.

### الخلاصة

تحاول هذه الدراسة إجراء تحليل مقارنة للموقفية (Modality) في اللغتين الإنجليزية والكردية. تكمن مشكلة الدراسة في الصعوبة التي يواجهها المتعلمون والطلاب الأكراد في قسمي الترجمة واللغة الإنجليزية في كلية اللغات في جامعة دهوك فيما يتعلق بإتقان الموقفية في اللغة الإنجليزية بشكل عام والأفعال المساعدة الموقفية بشكل خاص. الموقفية هي فئة المعنى المستخدمة للتعبير عن الضرورات والإمكانات أو الاحتماليات. والأهداف الرئيسية لهذه الدراسة هي وصف كل من الموقفية المعرفية والأدبية في اللغتين قيد الدراسة من أجل تحديد أوجه التشابه والاختلاف بينهما فيما يتعلق بالموقفية. وتظهر نتائج الدراسة أن الوسائل الموقفية الرئيسية في اللغة الإنجليزية هي أفعال مساعدة نحوية، بينما في اللغة الكردية هي في الغالب عناصر معجمية، وبالتالي يتم استخدام مجموعة متنوعة من العناصر المعجمية للتعبير عن فعل مساعد إنجليزي واحد. وتختتم الدراسة بعدد من الاستنتاجات والتوصيات.