

**ЖАС
ҒАЛЫМДАР****МОЛОДЫЕ
АВТОРЫ****YOUNG
AUTHORS**

UDC 81'36

G.S. Yeshniyaz,

PhD student of Kazakh Ablai Khan University of international relations and world languages,
III year, Almaty, Kazakhstan,
e-mail: yeshniyaz@gmail.com
Academic advisor – Dr of Philology, Professor K.T. Ryssaldy

Participant-internal possibility modality and its coding in Kazakh

This paper deals with the subcategory of modality – participant-internal possibility modality and its coding in Kazakh with – *A al* analytical formant. Despite the fact that the category of modality has been studied from the period of Aristotle, there is still no unanimity about its definition, its subcategories and its coding in human language. As the result of the research on the topic participant-internal possibility modality is identified as one of the subcategory of modality which deals with the ability and capacity of the subject of the proposition. In Kazakh participant-internal possibility modality is mostly given by analytical formants, especially by – *A al*. Moreover, it will be displayed that – *A al* expresses all semantic properties of participant-internal possibility modality such as inherent / learnt and mental / physical. Therefore it constitutes the core of the functional-semantic of the given modality. The paper also accounts for the interaction of – *A al* in modal usage with other category operators.

Key words: modality, participant-internal possibility modality, analytical formant, converb, ability, functional semantic- field, tense, voice.

Г.С. Ешнияз

Ішкі мүмкіндік модальділігі және оның қазақ тілінде зерделенуі

Мақала модальділік категориясының бір субкатегориясы – ішкі мүмкіндік модальділігінің қазақ тілінде зерделенуін қарастырады. Модальділік категориясы Аристотель жұмыстарынан бастап зерттелуіне қарамастан, қазіргі таңда тіл білімінде аталған категория, оның семантикалық құрылымы және тілде берілу жолдары нақты зерделенбеген. Зерттеу барысында ішкі мүмкіндік модальділігі сөйлем субъектісінің қабілетін білдіретін модальділіктің бір субкатегориясы ретінде анықталып, семантикалық құрылымдары туа біткен / жүре біткен, физикалық / ментальды ішкі мүмкіндік болып нақтыланды. Ішкі мүмкіндік модальділігі отандық тіл білімінде мүмкіндік модальділігінің семантикалық құрылымы ретінде түсініліп келеді. Алайда зерттеу барысында аталған категориялардың әртүрлі аспектілерді қамтып, бір категория ретінде қарастырыла алмайтындығы анықталды.

Қазақ тілінде ішкі мүмкіндік модальділігі аналитикалық форманттар арқылы беріледі. Оның ішінде – *A al* аналитикалық форманты аталған модальділікті барынша жан-жақты толық беретін формант болып, функционалды-семантикалық өрістің негізін құрайды. Сонымен қатар, мақалада – *A al* аналитикалық формантының модальділікті беруде басқа да тілдік категориялармен қатынасы қарастырылады.

Түйін сөздер: модальділік, ішкі мүмкіндік модальділігі, аналитикалық формант, көсемше, қабілеттілік, шақ, етіс.

Г.С. Ешняяз

Модальность внутренней возможности и пути выражения на казахском языке

В статье рассматривается одна из субкатегорий модальности – модальность внутренней возможности и ее выражение на казахском языке с помощью аналитической формы – *-А ал*. Несмотря на то, что категорию модальности начали изучать со времен Аристотеля, до сих пор не существует единого мнения относительно ее определения, ее субкатегорий и средств выражения в языке. В результате исследования модальность внутренней возможности определяется как одна из субкатегорий модальности, которая выражает способность субъекта пропозиции. В казахском языке модальность внутренней возможности в основном выражается аналитическими формантами, в особенности *-А ал*. Кроме того, в статье описывается, что *-А ал* выражает все семантические свойства модальности внутренней возможности, такие, как врожденные / приобретенные и ментальные / физические. Поэтому *-А ал* составляет ядро функционально-семантического поля данной категории. В статье также раскрываются отношения *-А ал* при выражении модальности внутренней возможности с другими языковыми категориями, такими, как залог, время и аспект.

Ключевые слова: модальность, модальность внутренней возможности, аналитический формант, деепричастие, способность, функционально-семантическое поле, время, залог.

The domain of modality is one of the controversial issues of linguistics in general as well as of Kazakh linguistics. This paper will focus on one of the subcategories of modality, participant-internal possibility modality (henceforth PIPM) which refers «...to a kind of possibility ... internal to a participant engaged in the state of affairs. In the case of possibility we are dealing with a participant's ability (capacity)» [1, 80] and its expression with analytical verb – *-А ал* in Kazakh.

Our central hypothesis is that – *-А ал* belongs to the core of the 'functional-semantic field' of participant-internal possibility modality and expresses all semantic meanings of ability like inherent / learnt and mental / physical.

There are only few works done to define modality and its means of expression in the Kazakh language. Most of them do not consider modality as a separate category, but investigate separate language units which express modality in general. For instance, Mamadilov Q. and Zhanpeyisov E. analyze modal verb constructions and their meanings, Tolegenov O. deals with mood as one way of expressing modality, Nurmakhanova A. investigates verb constructions and their functions in a sentence, considering expression of modality as one of their functions. As these works concern with formal properties of a language they are considered to be structural studies which treat language as a grammatical system consisting of rules. But the primary function of the language is communication and it is best seen and can be analyzed in its functions. Thus, functional approach is carried out in this paper to identify language units which express participant-internal possibility modality and ability meaning constitutes «functional-semantic field» of PIPM.

The only work on modality in the sense of functionalism in Kazakh is done by Qulmanov S. He explores modality as a functional-semantic category and its means of expression in Kazakh. He defines possibility, probability, obligative, volintative, prohibitive and preventative modality meanings in Kazakh and language units which express these meanings. But in the literature (Palmer F., Van Der Auwera J. and Plugian V.A., Bybee J.) it was pointed out that possibility or dynamic modality can be internal, which constitutes ability meaning, and external which gives root possibility meaning, which is not considered by Qulmanov S. In Kazakh these meanings are mostly given by different means and sometimes the same unit can express both of these meanings. In this paper we will concentrate only on participant-internal possibility and its coding with – *-А ал* analytical formant.

The data in this paper were drawn from 10 novels in Kazakh which comprise 3500 pages and 140 sentences or passages were collected with ability meaning. In 41% of cases ability meaning was given by *-А ал* analytical formant.

The structure of the paper is as follows. In Section 2 we will briefly look at the theoretical issues on the topic. Section 3 contains the core of our analysis, i.e. peculiarities of *-А ал* in giving ability meaning. Section 4 outlines relation of PIPM with other categories as aspect, voice.

Theoretical issues

According to Bybee J. and Fleischman S. «modality – ... is the semantic domain pertaining to elements of meaning that language expresses. It covers a broad range of semantic nuances – jussive,

desirative, intentive, hypothetical, potential, obligative, dubitative, hortatory, exclamative, etc. – whose common dominator is the addition of a supplement or overlay of meaning to the most neutral semantic value of the proposition of an utterance, namely factual and declarative» [2, 2]. We understand modality as an additional meaning to the proposition of the sentence. The overlaying meaning can be explained in terms of possibility and necessity as the action or situation described in the preposition can be 1) necessarily / possibly true / false from the point of speaker (epistemic modality); 2) necessary / possible to do from the point of speaker (deontic modality); 3) necessary / possible to do for the subject of the sentence (dynamic modality). The latter meaning covers PIP modality.

Many scholars tend to use different terms to refer to ability meaning. In this work we look at the classical works on modality. Bybee J., Perkins J., Pagliuca W. treat ability meaning as one of the submeanings of agent-oriented modality and define it as «ability reports the existence of internal enabling conditions in the agent with respect to the predicate action». Also add that ability meaning can generalize to «root possibility, which reports on general enabling conditions and is not restricted to the internal condition of ability, but also reports on general external conditions, such as social and physical» [3, 177-178].

Palmer F. considers ability meaning is covered by sub-class of dynamic modality «subject-oriented» modality and defines that «... dynamic modality is subject-oriented in the sense that it is concerned with the ability or volition of the subject of the sentence, rather than opinions (epistemic) or attitudes (deontic) of the speaker (and addressee)» [4, 36]. The reason for choosing the term «subject-oriented» lies in that fact that only animate creatures have an ability to do something, but the subject of the sentence can be inanimate which have power or quality to do the action in the predicate [5, 76-79].

Van Der Auwera J. and Plugian V. A. favors the term «participant-internal possibility» which means that inner qualities of the subject of the sentence make it possible to fulfill the action given in the proposition [1, 80]. The term can also be contrasted to «participant-external possibility» where because of the external circumstance it is possible to carry out the action. Terms used by Palmer F., Bybee J. et al. and Auwera J. et al. in some sense cover the same semantic domain. For instance, «subject-oriented possibility», «ability» and «participant-internal

possibility» refer to ability/capacity meaning, but we likewise side with Auwera J. et al. as ‘participant-internal possibility» is more specific, can be opposed to its counterpart, also it refers not only to the ability but also capacity of the participant. Also we exploit ability meaning in relation to animate subjects. According to The good English Guide «ability is an acquired skill: her ability to speak several languages. A capacity is more an innate talent: her capacity for learning languages» [6, 43]. Thus, participant-internal possibility can be further classified as inherent / learnt and mental / physical.

– *A al* – participant-internal possibility modality operator

According to M. Erdal «a verb phrase can beside a fully lexical kernel, include another verb, which can be grammatical to varying degrees ... when only one of the verbs in a verb phrase is lexical to any degree the construction is called ‘analytical» [7, 244]. In Kazakh an analytical verb consists of lexical verb inflected by auxiliary verb and they express a certain grammatical meaning. For example, if we look at the morphological structure of the following analytical verbs, all of them consist of auxiliary verbs preceded by lexical verbs ending in converb suffixes.

1 a. ayt-a al-a-dī,
say-CV take-CV-3SG
(He) can say
oqı-p žür,
study-CV go-3SG
(He) is studying

In these examples – *e ber*, – *a al*, – *p žür* are analytical formants, which add additional grammatical meanings (modal, aspectual) to the main verb. Each of these analytical formants has an indivisible, single meaning. «They express one single meaning no matter how many components they are composed of and the meanings of components are indivisible and idiomatic. Thus, it is impossible to add any other morphological element to the analytical formant structure» [8, 7]. For instance, – *A al* analytical formant should consist of these exact elements to express ability meaning, if we use another converb suffix like – *ip al*, it will have another meaning, precisely, benefactive meaning.

The most prominent operator of ability in Kazakh is – *A al* analytical formant. It is composed of present converb – *a* (with variants –*e* (used after stems ending in consonant) and –*y* (used after stems ending in vowels); this do not change the meaning) and auxiliary verb *al* which lexically means «take»,

but in this format its meaning is bleached. According to Clauson G. the origin and development of the form is obscure [9, 82]. The earliest usage of this form as a marker of possibility / ability seems to be in a Khwarezmian Turkic text from the first half of the 14th century [10, 83]. Since then – *A al* «has developed into one of the most prominent possibility operator in the Turkic languages which is spread specially throughout the languages of the Northwestern and Southeastern subgroups [10, 1-28] in «non-fused (e.g. Tatar, Kazakh and Kirghiz) and fused variants (e.g. Uzbek, Uyghur)». [11, 83]

As it was mentioned above in – *A al* analytical formant auxiliary verb *al* «take» has advanced its lexical meaning to a grammatical one as a result of grammaticalization. When – *al* is preceded by converb suffixes it gains a modal usage and functions like *English* «can / be able to» or Russian «мочь / уметь» (can / may, to be able to. Я могу / умею танцевать. I can dance.) (3, 4). Although when – *al* is not in analytical formant scope it is used in its lexical meaning (2) :

2. Oġan aqşa usıñip edim, al-dı

Him money offer, take-PST

When I offered him money, he took (it).

3. Suw-da balıq-tay žüz-e al-a-mın. (M. Maġaiyn)
water-LOC fish- ADV swim-CV AUX-PRES-1SG

I can swim like a fish in water.

Edige – ädebiyetši. Sondıqtan ol ne näirse-ni bol-ma-sın asqaq,

Edige – literary man-3SG. Therefore he any thing-ACC be-NEG-DAT lofty,

äserli et-ip süwrette-y al-a-dı.

Impressive AUX-CV describe –CV AUX-PRES-3SG

Edige is a literary man. Therefore he can describe anything loftily, impressively. (M. Maġaiyn)

- *A al* analytical formant does not describe the action itself, but shows its state. For instance, in (3) and (4) not the action of swimming and describing is manifested, but its state of possible actualization.

- *A al* can express inherent /learnt and physical and mental participant-internal possibility meanings. Sometimes the distinction between these meanings is not clear cut. For example :

5. -Qureke, ol bäri-miz-ge ortaқ qarındas qoy. Ek-eüw-miz tiri

Qureke, she all-3PL-DAT common sister PART. Two-ENUM-3PL alive

tur-sa-q on-ı qayda-n bol-sa da qutqar-a al-a-mız.

stand-COND-3PL she-ACC where-ACC be-COND too rescue-CV AUX-FUT-1PL.

- *Qureke, she is our sister. If we are alive, we will be able rescue her from any situation.*

(Q. Shabdanulı)

6. Men –žaz-atın adam-mın. Sol Ivan Ivanovič qusap men de šatıp-butıp žaz-a

I – write-PART human-1SG. That Ivan Ivanovič like I too anyhow write- CV

al-a-mın. On-ıñ kör-gen-in men de kör-di-m.

AUX-PRES-1SG. He-2SG.POSS see-PART-ACC I too see-PST-1SG.

I – am a writer. I can also write anyhow as that Ivan Ivanovič. I also experienced what he did. (M. Maġaiyn)

In (5) in order to be able to rescue somebody you have to be physically strong and mentally skilled. In this sentences physical ability meaning overlaps with mental ability of a person. In (6) the overlapping meanings are inherent and learnt ones. Someone needs talent and acquired skills to be a writer. Talent and acquired skills of the speaker is displayed by the context well, where he admits that he is a writer he is talking about his talent, when he refers to his experience, learnt skills are meant.

Nevertheless, in most cases these meaning are given separately. For example:

7. -So da söz bol-ıp pa! Özim de köter-e al-a-mın.

– That to word be-CV Q! REFL. too lift –CV AUX-FUT-1SG

It is not a big deal! I can lift that myself. (S. Šäymerdenov)

8. Žat-qa ayt-uw kerek bol-sa, Abay otir-ğan žer-de o-nı

Memory-DAT say-INF need be-COND, Abay sit-PART place-LOC it-ACC

aġız-ıp, suwdırat-ıp ayt-ıp ta ber-e al-a-dı.

flow-CV, fluent-CV say-CV too give-CV AUX-PRES-3SG.

When it is necessary to say by heart, Abay can say that quickly and fluently. (M. Äüwezov)

9. Biraq küz-diñ ay-sız qarañģi tün-in-de, dauwıl-dı, žauwın-dı

But autumn-GEN moon-ADJ dark night-ACC-LOC, wind-ADJ, rain-ADJ

tuni, kerek bol-sa žalgız tüp tobilģini, žalgız šoġır qaraġaydı

night, need be-COND sole bush spirea-ACC, sole bush pine tree-ACC

tab-a al-atın.

find-CV AUX-PART.

But, when it is necessary, even in dark moonless night, windy, rainy night of autumn he can find a bush of spirea, a bush of pine tree. (M. Äüwezov)

Whereas (7) displays a physical strength / ability of a person to lift a heavy thing, (8) shows Abay's mental skill to learn something very vast and say it fluently. In (4) Edige because of his innate capacity can describe anything impressively and beautifully. (9) shows that person is so skilled and knows the area very well that even in moonless, rainy and windy night can find a bush of tree in steps of Kazakh, where were no signs of direction.

Interaction of participant-internal possibility modality with other grammatical categories

If we analyze all analytical verbs of the given example, it not difficult to notice that lexical verb in the construction takes a converb suffix, thus remains in a non-finite form, whereas auxiliary verb is inflected by the tense and personal markers. – *A al* inflected by present tense markers shows that person have a general ability/capacity to carry out the action (3),(4),(6),(8), by a past tense marker shows that a person had a general ability (9) or was able to fulfill a certain single action. Therefore, – *A al*+ PRES refers to Iterative aspect and – *A al*+ PST refers to both Iterative and Dynamic aspect. In future form – *A al* shows, first, an ability in the future, on the other hand speaker's belief that a subject of a sentence will be able to a carry out a certain activity. In this sense, PIPM overlaps with epistemic modality.

Oralbayeva N. in her analysis on the combinability of – *A al* with other forms, stated that as – *A al* indicates the person's ability, it is inflected to the verb with tense and personal markers, other

suffixes which are connected with the process of an action precede – *A al* [8, 79]. Analyzing our data, we have found out that only voice markers precede – *A al*, precisely, causative (10), cooperative-reciprocal (11) and reflexive-middle voice suffixes (12):

10. *Žämiyla qaygı-sı-n da, ökpe-si-n de*
Žämiyla sorrow-3SG.POSS-ACC too,
resentment-3SG.POSS-ACC too
aqıl-ğa žeñ-giz-e al-dı.
 mind-DAT win-CAUS.CV AUX-PST.

Žämiyla could control her sorrow and resentment by her sense. (I. Esenberliyn)

11. – *Sen ekeü-miz til tab-ıs-a al-a-miz.*

– You two-1PL tongue find-REC-CV AUX-FUT-1PL.

– *We can get on well (with each other).* (M. Mağaiyn)

12. *Maxmut... sırt adam-ğa sipayı kör-in-e al-atın.*

Maxmut exterior person-DAT polite see-REF-CV AUX-PART.

Maxmut could seem polite to other people. (I. Esenberliyn)

The semantics of – *A al* and passive voice suffix is not compatible as ability always goes with the subject of the sentence, which is not the case in passive voice. Palmer F. illustrates this feature in English which is also true for Kazakh: «the semantics would suggest that neutral dynamic modals ought to be voice neutral and that subject-oriented once ought not. If it is possible for Bill to beat John, it is possible for John to be beaten by Bill, but it is not reasonable to suggest that, if Bill has the ability to beat him, John has the ability to be beaten.» [4, 101].

Abbreviations

1SG	first-person singular	CV	converb	REFL. reflexive
1PL	first-person plural	DAT	dative	
2SG	second-person singular	ENUM	enumerator	
3SG	third-person singular	FUT	future	
3PL	third-person plural	GEN	genitive	
ACC	accusative	LOC	locative	
ADJ	adjective	NEG	negative	
ADV	adverb	PART	participle	
AUS	auxiliary	POSS	possessive	
CAUS	causative	PST.	Past	
COND	conditional	Q.	interrogative	

References

- 1 Van Der Auwera J., Plungian V.A. Modality's semantic map // *Linguistic Typology*. – 1998. – № 2. – P. 79–124.
- 2 Bybee J., Fleischman S. *Modality in Grammar and discourse*. – Amsterdam / Philadelphia: John Benjamins publishing company, 1995. – 575 p.
- 3 Bybee J., R. Perkins and W. Pagliuca. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. – Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994. – 420 p.
- 4 Palmer F.R. *Modality and the English modals*. – 2 Edition. – London: Logman, 1990. – 256 p.
- 5 Palmer F.R. *Mood and modality*. – 3 Edition. – Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2001. – 236 p.
- 6 Howard C. *The good English Guide*. – Kent: Mackeys Ltd, 1993. – 97 p.
- 7 Erdal M.A. *Grammar of Old Turkic*. – Netherlands: Brill NV, 2004. – 583 p.
- 8 Oralbaeva N. *Qazaq tilindegi etistiktiñ analitikalıq formanttarınıñ qurılısı men maǵnası*. – Almaty: Ğilim baspası, 1979. – 195 p.
- 9 Clauson G. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. – Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972. – 1040 p.
- 10 Schönig C. (Un)Möglichkeitformen in den sogenannten Altaischen Sprachen // *Materialia Turcica*. – 1987. – № 13. – P. 1–28.
- 11 Rentzsch J. *Modality in the Baburnama // Turkic languages*. – 2011. – № 15. – P. 82–83.

Литература

- 1 Ван дер Аувера И., Плунгян В.А. Modality's semantic map // *Linguistic Typology*. – 1998. – № 2. – С. 79-124.
- 2 Байби Д., Флейшман С. *Modality in Grammar and discourse*. – Амстердам / Филадельфия: John Benjamins publishing company, 1995. – 575 с.
- 3 Байби Д., Перкинс Р., Паглиука У. *The evolution of grammar: Tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. – Чикаго: University of Chicago Press, 1994. – 420 с.
- 4 Палмер Ф.Р. *Modality and the English modals*. – 2 Edition. – Лондон: Логман, 1990. – 256 с.
- 5 Палмер Ф.Р. *Mood and modality*. – 3-е изд. – Кембридж: Cambridge University Press, 2001. – 236 с.
- 6 Хоуард С. *The good English Guide*. – Кент: Mackeys Ltd, 1993. – 97с.
- 7 Эрдал М.А. *Grammar of Old Turkic*. – Нидерланды: Brill NV, 2004. – 583 с.
- 8 Оралбаева Н. *Қазақ тіліндегі етістіктердің аналитикалық форманттарының құрылысы мен мағынасы*. – Алматы: Ғылым баспасы, 1979. – 195 б.
- 9 Клаусон Д. *An etymological dictionary of pre-thirteenth-century Turkish*. – Оксфорд: Clarendon Press, 1972. – 1040 с.
- 10 Шониг С. (Un)Möglichkeitformen in den sogenannten Altaischen Sprachen // *Materialia Turcica*. – 1987. – № 13. – С. 1–28.
- 11 Рентш Д. *Modality in the Baburnama // Turkic languages*. – 2011. – № 15. – С. 82– 83.